

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

An 557

THE LOBECK BILL

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. R. 9292

A BILL RELATING TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF
THE BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

APRIL 20 AND 21, 1914



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1914

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Statement of Representative C. O. Lobeck.....	3
Statement of Representative Ernest W. Roberts.....	7
Statement of Mr. William E. Russell.....	10
Statement of Representative William P. Borland.....	13
Statement of Representative Charles F. Booher.....	21
Statement of Dr. V. A. Moore.....	25
Statement of Dr. M. P. Ravenel.....	34
Statement of Representative Claude Weaver.....	39
Statement of Dr. S. J. Walkley.....	54
Statement of Representative William N. Baltz.....	110
Statement of Mr. Charles W. Pagle, jr.....	110
Statement of Representative John J. Mitchell.....	111
Statement of Representative James T. McDermott.....	111
Statement of Representative George E. Gorman.....	112
Statement of Representative Alfred G. Allen.....	113
Statement of Representative George C. Scott.....	114
Statement of Representative William J. Cary.....	116

THE LOBECK BILL.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, April 20, 1914.

The committee was called to order at 10.30 a. m., Hon. Asbury F. Lever (chairman), presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lobeck is in charge of the hearing this morning, and I would ask him to present his case in his own way.

STATEMENT OF HON. C. O. LOBECK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEBRASKA.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, at a meeting of the National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees held at Chicago May 12 to 14, 1913, a number of resolutions were passed in regard to the salaries and classifications of the men employed in the Bureau of Animal Industry work. On November 8, 1913, I was requested by the executive committee of the National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees to introduce a bill in conformance with the Chicago convention resolutions, and it was introduced by me on November 14, 1913, H. R. 9292. Most of you are familiar with it, as you have had correspondence with people in all parts of the country, and I have a large envelope here full of indorsements approving of the bill from people throughout the country. In short, the bill provides as follows:

Section 2 says the entrance salary of the veterinary inspectors shall be \$1,400, and there shall be an annual advance of \$100 up to \$2,400.

Section 3 provides that the entrance salary of the meat inspectors shall be \$1,000, with an annual advance of \$100 up to \$1,600.

Section 4 provides that the inspectors' assistants, whose entrance salaries are \$840, shall receive an annual advance of \$100 up to \$1,600.

Section 5 provides that all stock examiners receiving less than \$1,600 shall have an annual increase of \$100 per year up to \$1,600.

Section 6 provides that all skilled laborers shall receive an annual increase of \$100 up to \$1,200; and

Section 7 provides that all clerks outside of the executive offices in the city of Washington, who are in the classified service, with an entrance salary at \$900, shall be increased \$100 per year to \$1,500. Those, in short, are the terms of this bill.

Since the formation of the Bureau of Animal Industry work, when the examinations were held, certain increases were promised

the veterinarians and inspectors' assistants in the service throughout the country, but there never was appropriation enough to do that, and so the department has had to write letters stating that on account of the considerable increase in the cost of inspection, due to the constantly increasing number of establishments, without a corresponding increase in the appropriation to carry on the work, the bureau finds it impossible to adhere to the schedules of promotion which have been announced in the past. I have here a letter from the committee of the Bureau of Animal Industry employees, which I will read:

St. Louis, Mo., November 8, 1913.

Hon. C. O. LOBECK,
Representative Second District Nebraska,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LOBECK: We, the members of the executive committee of the National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, at our meeting in St. Louis to-day, unanimously adopted a draft of the classification bill for the employees of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry.

We herewith inclose a copy of that draft and respectfully request that you introduce a bill in exact conformance with this draft at the earliest possible moment.

We are to-day transmitting to the secretary of our South Omaha branch a copy of this draft, with request that he immediately advise you whether or not that branch will support a bill in accordance with this draft.

The members of our South St. Joseph, Mo., branch are urging us to have this bill introduced at once. The South St. Joseph members feel very grateful for your earnest efforts in our behalf and have requested us to extend to you their sincere appreciation and assurance of their loyal support at all times.

Trusting that you shall arrange to favor us by introducing the bill at an early date, we remain, with best wishes,

Fraternally, yours,

J. E. GIBSON,
President.

EDWARD J. KELLY,
First Vice President.

S. J. WALKLEY,
Secretary.

A. H. LOGAN,
Treasurer.

A. A. BRYAN,
Chairman Advisory Board.

C. O. HAWKINS,
Chairman Organization Committee.

The question will be asked, What will be the extra cost to the Government on this work? In 1906, when \$3,000,000 was set aside, the number of Federal meat inspection establishments throughout the country was 163; in 1907 it was 708; in 1908 it was 787; in 1909 the number was 876; in 1910 it was 919; in 1911 it was 936; in 1912, with 259 cities and towns, it was 940; in 1913, when an increase was made to \$3,200,000, there was 910 establishments. Naturally, that has taken more help, more inspectors and more veterinarians, and the bureau has been unable to make the increases promised when these men took their examinations. The work is of a nature in itself dangerous, and anyone who has gone through a packing house and noted the character of the work knows that it is. It takes skill. The veterinarian has to acquire a certain education, a high-school education, and has to have a three years' course in veterinary medicine, and anyone who has watched these packing plants, as I have seen them in South Omaha, can testify to that. The meat inspector has to have

five years' training in a packing establishment, at least, before he takes an examination, and they have to be exceedingly skillful men. They have to know what they are doing. It means everything to the health of the public that they should be skillful. In fact, these packing establishments throughout the country are increasing in number all the time, and with the advent of modern machinery and methods the work must be done quickly. They must be constantly on the job. I can go further into detail, but I would like to refer now to this matter of the cost. Upon inquiring of the Hon. D. F. Houston, Secretary of Agriculture, into the question of expense, I received a letter from him, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 10, 1914.*

HON. C. O. LOBECK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LOBECK: Replying further to your letter of the 8th instant, without considering promotions of those employees now or hereafter receiving \$2,400 per annum or those engaged in meat inspection in the Department at Washington, or for the laboratory forces in Washington or in the field, the increased amount has been based on the size of the force as at January 1 last, and the increases would be as follows:

First year..... \$262,760

MR. HAUGEN (interposing). That is the advance each year over the preceding year?

MR. LOBECK. No.

MR. HAUGEN. If that is the advance each year over the preceding year, it would make a much greater sum than the increase over the present appropriation.

MR. LOBECK. The total increase in the bill in 10 years would amount to \$1,441,560.

MR. HAUGEN. That is spread over a period of 10 years?

MR. LOBECK. That is my understanding of this letter.

MR. REILLY. What does your bill call for?

MR. LOBECK. It is just a classification of salaries. That is taken from the bill and this report here is from Secretary Houston.

MR. REILLY. If the increases were made at \$100 a year, it would be something over an increase of \$200,000 a year.

MR. LOBECK. It would be \$262,000. The entire increase in the first 10 years would be \$1,441,560.

MR. REILLY. Those increases are not the increases of each succeeding year over the preceding year?

MR. LOBECK. It gets lower each year.

MR. JACOWAY. I see in section 8 of your bill here you make an indefinite appropriation. I want to call your attention to the fact that I think an indefinite appropriation would not pass the Auditor of the Treasury Department. There would have to be a definite sum appropriated.

MR. LOBECK. Well, I think that ought to be considered by the committee.

MR. JACOWAY. I thought maybe you wished to offer an amendment.

MR. LOBECK. I am not ready. The committee is more familiar with it than I am.

MR. HAUGEN. Just read all those figures, so we may get them in the record.

Mr. LOBECK. I will finish reading these figures from the letter of Secretary Houston, starting where I left off when interrupted:

	Increase.
Second year.....	\$243,800
Third year.....	241,600
Fourth year.....	235,200
Fifth year.....	144,000
Sixth year.....	133,000
Seventh year.....	78,900
Eighth year.....	52,200
Ninth year.....	25,100
Tenth year.....	25,000
Total.....	1,441,560

Yours, very truly,

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary.*

Mr. LOBECK. I ask that this letter be incorporated in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be done.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is the basis of the estimate from the department?

Mr. LOBECK. Yes. The total number of employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry on March 7, 1914, was 3,453, of which number there were 1,063 veterinary inspectors, 965 meat inspectors, 106 clerks in the field, 186 stock examiners, 508 inspectors' assistants, and 27 skilled laborers.

Mr. RUBEY. Does that include the number of traveling inspectors who go about inspecting these plants?

Mr. LOBECK. That is the force that is given to us by the department.

Mr. RUBEY. Does it include the traveling inspectors?

Mr. LOBECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBEY. The employees at the stock yards are included?

Mr. LOBECK. The figures I gave are the entire force affected by this bill.

Mr. RUBEY. That is the entire force connected with the bureau?

Mr. LOBECK. No, sir; 2,855 is the number affected by this bill. Now, I would like to say something as to the merits of the bill.

Mr. JACOWAY. The appropriation for the last fiscal year was \$3,200,000. If I understand your figures correctly, at the end of 10 years we would have added to that \$1,441,560, making the total annual appropriation, \$4,441,560?

Mr. LOBECK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this question: The bill now in the Senate carries an increase of \$100,000 for this purpose over last year's appropriation?

Mr. LOBECK. That would be \$3,300,000.

The CHAIRMAN. It could hardly be said to be the policy of the committee to increase this appropriation by \$100,000 each year, but I think you could very well argue that point pretty successfully. If the committee should allow an increase of \$100,000 or \$150,000 each year over the preceding year's appropriation, what would be the necessity for this bill?

Mr. LOBECK. Well, if the committee will do that, it would act the same, except that the bill classifies how they shall be advanced.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that Congress is better able to classify these men than the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. LOBECK. Well, so far as that is concerned, some one has to classify them.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ERNEST W. ROBERTS, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS.**

Mr. ROBERTS. It seems to me Mr. Chairman, the friends of this bill are seeking to do for the employeecs engaged in this meat-inspection service just exactly what Congress has done for the postal employees, the clerks and carriers. We are fixing by law certain definite promotion for the men. I think from what I have gleaned, in conversation with Dr. Melvin, that if this bureau of the department had all the money it desired they would take care of the increases for the men, so far as the money would allow, but there being no promotion, no increase of salary fixed by law, and they being hampered by the amount of money given them, they have always told me that they could not increase the salaries of the present employees for the reason that the demands of the service required the additional appropriation to be used for the new employees who received the same pay.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that to be the position of the department; but my premises were that, assuming the committee allowed the increase asked for in this bill, would it be wise for Congress to fix these salaries by law, or would it be better to leave that to the discretion of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ROBERTS. My personal opinion is that Congress should do it. I think that would be far better than to allow it to remain in the discretion of any bureau chief or any head of a department. Then the men going into the service would know exactly what is ahead of them, and there would be no opportunity for favoritism or anything of that sort, as all men would know they would receive a square deal if they are doing their part and rendering efficient service.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I think the best service is secured by having the responsibility rest in the department where you make some man the directing head. I notice in reading this bill the increase is a compulsory increase, and it takes away from the department the power to enforce efficiency. A man goes in there and gets a hundred-dollar increase after the first year, and the next year he may say that he will give the best service he can and yet he may neglect it, and still the head of the bureau must, under the law, increase a hundred dollars a year the salary of that man.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would say that, so far as I have learned, there is no complaint in the Post Office Department in regard to the efficiency of the clerks and carriers, and we have there in effect the same compulsory increase under certain conditions. Now, if either the Agricultural or Post Office Departments have incompetent men they can get rid of them. When this service was established it was recognized it would require men of an exceptionally high order of intelligence and experience, and those men were getting more money in outside service than they could get under what was promised them when they came into the service of the Government, and to draw them into service the Government promised them increases. But after they come into the service they are up against this proposition, that Congress has not given the department money enough to enable the department to carry out their own promises—express promises that were made to these men.

Mr. SLOAN. You must realize this was a new department of the Government, this food inspection, and Congress was not as liberal

with it as it should have been, perhaps, and it has developed, perhaps, to a greater extent than most of us who voted for the measure thought it would, so that in order efficiently to carry out the service of inspection the department has been put to it to get men enough, even at the low salaries they are now paying, to bring it up to an efficient standard, and they had to make certain promises they have not carried out.

Mr. ROBERTS. If I was correctly informed—and I looked through my files in regard to it—the statement, if I am not mistaken, was held out by the Civil Service Commission, to these men who took the examination, that they would get a certain amount of money when going in the service and then at certain periods they would get increases.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the Civil Service Commission issued such an order as that, I suggest a copy of it be put in these hearings, so that we may have it in the record.

Mr. ROBERTS. It was done, as I understand, after conference with the bureau, because the Civil Service Commission of its own volition would not make such a statement as that.

Mr. MAGUIRE. The record ought to show it if there was such a statement made.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to find that myself and insert it in the record, so that it might appear clearly how these men were brought into the Government service, and it seems to me they have materially strengthened their claim for salaries commensurate with the work they are doing and salaries which they were led to believe, and promised, so far as governmental promises can be made, they would receive.

Mr. LOBECK. Let me answer Mr. Maguire's question in regard to increases. It is now considered advisable to place that provision in the bill.

Mr. MAGUIRE. It seems to me a very vital policy.

Mr. LOBECK. The secretary of the association informed me they expected to have the bill amended so that efficiency will count.

Mr. MAGUIRE. So that it will not be an enforced promotion, but in accordance with a certain character of efficiency.

Mr. JACOWAY. There could not be an enforced efficiency.

Mr. MAGUIRE. But the promotion is enforced, and as long as a man is in the service under the civil service he can not be dismissed without charges.

Mr. ROBERTS. The clerks in the Bureau of Animal Industry come under the same rules as those in any other department. The head of the department came before this committee and complained he was losing men. The same question comes up in all their departments.

Mr. LOBECK. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would say that if any department of the Government, through its bureau or through the Civil Service Commission, have held out a promise to the men that if they will come into the service they will get certain increases of pay, and they have not gotten them there, it is because of the absence of legislation to carry out that promise.

Mr. HAUGEN. There seems to be some misapprehension here as to the action of the committee and Congress, and it might be well to

state the history of the case. When this law was enacted in 1906 it was estimated that about \$1,800,000 would be required annually. The committee recommended a permanent annual appropriation of \$3,000,000, leaving it to the discretion of the department to fix these salaries. The department has come in here year after year, and this committee has recommended the amounts asked for by the department. The amount estimated this year, in addition to the \$3,000,000, was \$300,000. That amount was reported by this committee and agreed to by the House. The appropriation for the current year would be \$3,300,000. The salaries for last year aggregated about \$3,120,000, the increase would give the department about \$180,000 over last year. There seems to be some discrepancy here as to the estimates made. The amount required to pay salaries as provided in this bill is \$262,000, while the chief of the bureau asked for \$179,000.

Mr. ROBERTS. I know from correspondence with men in this service, employed in my own district, that each year when there has been an increase allowed they expected the department would keep its faith with them and increase their salaries, but they have not. It almost seems that it would be but a fair proposition to put the matter in such shape that the men would get what has been promised and what is due them in all fairness and equity.

Mr. HAUGEN. I simply made this statement to show what the attitude of the committee has been, and so far as the increases are concerned, that is a matter for the department and the employees to settle. I think the committee should not be criticised.

Mr. LOBECK. I know the department at this time on these increases for the coming year is already complaining; that some of the increases for these employees should have been made last year, but there was not money enough to go around and some increases will be made the first of the fiscal year.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will say to the gentleman that I believe they should have increases, but at the same time the committee should be placed in the proper light here.

Mr. SLOAN. I think it should be put on a different basis. I do not think the Agricultural Department, or any other department, has any power to promise anything that Congress may be obliged to reject in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we are all agreed on that proposition.

Mr. SLOAN. My own notion is that these men, doing the work they have been doing, are entitled from Congress to a large share, if not all, of what they are asking, but that Congress is obliged to make good any promise that the Agricultural Department or the Civil Service Commission made heretofore is entirely erroneous and should not be given serious consideration at this time.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think it is common knowledge that the commission has no power to fix the salaries of employees.

Mr. LOBECK. I would like to present at this time Mr. Russell, of New York, who has come here to make a statement in regard to this bill, and I will finish my remarks when he gets through.

STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM E. RUSSELL, PRESIDENT OF
FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE SOCIETY OF NEW YORK.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, let me state in the beginning that I am not a Government employee. I was until about a year ago. I am president, however, of the Federal Civil Service Society of the State of New York, an organization composed of Government employees from the 10 Federal departments, and in this organization are the gentlemen of this Bureau of Animal Industry—the veterinarians, the meat inspectors, stock examiners, inspectors' assistants, skilled laborers, and clerks.

I shall not endeavor to go into the intricacies of the problem from a technical standpoint. If you will permit me, I desire to make a brief comparison, first, of the Government service as a whole and the service outside the Government, of private employment, and then a brief comparison of the work done in this bureau and the discriminations practiced against it as compared with the other branches of the Government service.

I know it is commonly believed that the Government service is a sinecure. That belief is unfortunately too prevalent. The people at large, I think, have the idea that Government employees are badly underworked and badly overpaid. Now, I think that is negatived by the fact of such great numbers of resignations every year. I know it is often stated on the floor of the House that Government employees never die and few resign, or perhaps the reverse. At any rate, the figures show that there are an alarming number of resignations in the Government service.

Now, from a business standpoint, the Government invites young men and women to come into its service on salaries in excess of the wage scale paid in private life. It only wants the best, those who can qualify physically, mentally, and morally. The Government searches into the innermost life of a man before it takes him into its employ. It puts him in a competitive examination, and he must demonstrate his mental superiority at least in this particular branch, and he is given an appointment in the service. It is true, he is paid an entrance wage in excess of private employment; but let us see, on the other hand, what the disadvantages are connected with the service.

You have not in the Government service the necessary incentive to stimulate a man's ambition. You erect a wall at a certain point where the classified service ends and say to a man when he gets to that point through efficiency, "You can not hope to get any further." The administrative positions under the Government service are presidential appointees—that is, the heads of departments, subheads, etc.

Now, take the private employer, on the other hand. The youngest office boy when he enters the office of a corporation has the presidency of that corporation open to him; and if he demonstrates the ability, he can get to that presidency. That is not true in the Government service, and the ambitious man or woman when he or she finds himself or herself up against this wall very naturally becomes discouraged. It is simply human to do so. We often find promotion on merit is a theory, although the civil service is predicated upon the merit system. They find that too often influences other than merit operate in the promotion of a man. That is not the fault of civil service; it is mal-

administration that must be censured. The doctrine of civil service should not be condemned merely because there is malpractice on the part of certain officials.

It is commonly asserted that the salaries paid in private life are far below the standard of the Government service. The Government clerks draw \$1,000 and \$1,200 and \$1,500, and the critics point to the department store clerk who sells ribbons and other things, and who gets only from \$12 to \$18 and up to \$25 a week at the outside, and make a comparison that is unfair to the Government employees.

Now, it must be borne in mind that these men in private life have not stood any test or qualified in any particular way. And they have an avenue of promotion open to them which is denied to the employee of the Government.

Another thing that operates against the civil-service employee is that he is robbed of certain rights as a citizen when he enters the service. He is barred from exercising the inherent right of every man in this country to express himself politically as he desires. The moment the Government employee gets up on a public platform and states what political doctrines he believes in, he is told to get out of the service. He is barred from serving on any political committee or in taking any active part in political affairs. Under the operation of these laws you have segregated a great class of employees and put them in the employ of the Government with certain restrictions. You put up heavy bars against them, and it was only recently they were allowed to come here and solicit Congress for an increase of their pay or for a redress of grievances.

These men in the Government service have no protection in the courts, no redress for unjust suspension, nothing whatever to rely upon except the integrity of the man right above them, and too often these gentlemen, who are heads of bureaus or subheads—they are only human—desire to make way for some friend of theirs and their subordinates suffer. That is the position of these men. The heads of these departments are not coming down here to plead for increased salaries. The position of the Cabinet officer—the head of one of these great departments—is directly antagonistic to this kind of action. The Cabinet officer has four years to serve. He realizes the success of his administration depends upon economy and the only way for him to economize is to keep down the salaries. The employees are on the opposite side of the fence. They want to go ahead, but they can not rely on a Cabinet officer to get what they want. They have to come here to you for their chance, and it is gratifying to see you give them to-day this hearing and a fair chance to present the real grievances.

Now, just a few words in regard to these men in the Bureau of Animal Industry. They are picked men in the Government service. The veterinarians in the service are men of scientific knowledge. They are required to have a college training. They are required to work at unusual and extraordinary hours. These great killing plants begin work when most of us are still reposing calmly in bed. They get out at 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning and must be at the plant at 5 or 6 a. m. The other men are at work there until 12 o'clock at night. Their work is done in the midst of unpleasant surroundings, in the midst of blood and steam, and so forth. It is a most unpleasant task. They are working alongside of men who get far greater

wages than they do. The veterinarians are rated to \$1,800 per annum, whereas you find in the big plants private employees doing the same work and getting salaries of \$6,000 and \$7,000 a year, no more capable than these men employed by the Government at \$1,800.

These men are conservationists. They are protecting the public health, and they are doing very important work. When the Government passed this pure food law it did one of the best things it ever did. These men are the guardians of that law, working under a pressure of 40 to 70 carcasses an hour, and upon them rests the responsibility of protecting the public health. They are subject to the temptations that naturally arise when you put responsibility on your representatives of the Government who are opposed by representatives of private interests. It is to the interest of these private gentlemen to sell beef whether it is diseased or not. They paid the price for it, and if they can sell it to make their profit they want to do it. These men are subjected to great temptation. You want men of integrity to do work of that character, and you can not hope to get them when you bar the door of promotion to these men and pay an entrance salary that never increases. You start assistants in at \$840, inspectors at \$1,000, and the veterinarians at \$1,400, and bar them at \$1,800, and with the result that they seek private employment. That is not to be wondered at. As an economic proposition, is it wise for the Government to do that? You enter young men at 18 or 20 years of age, and let them work five years. That is the period when they are learning—the probation period. Now, suppose they leave the Government service; the Government has spent a great deal of money on them and received no adequate return.

Private corporations operate on a different basis. They do everything they can to encourage their employees to remain in their service. They realize a man's efficiency is bound to increase from year to year. The more he learns about the business the more valuable he is to the employer. The Government apparently operates on the opposite theory.

Critics of the Government employee often point to the great number of candidates for a vacant position and say that the dissatisfied employee ought to resign and call attention to the fact that there are lots of people to take his place. That is true in the case of you gentlemen here. I dare say if any gentleman of this committee would to-day announce his withdrawal—and perhaps if he didn't announce it—there would be 25 or 30 people wanting to come here to take his place. It is not an indication that the position carries too large a salary. If you gentlemen could face this problem upon its merits you might vote yourselves \$15,000 a year.

Mr. JACOWAY. If you looked at the Record of last Saturday you would change your mind on that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Well; as a matter of fact, take any position in the Government service—take the Cabinet officers as an illustration—you do not pay them the salaries they can command outside, for when they leave the Government service they receive two or three or four times as much money as they were paid by the Government. I realize that you gentlemen are facing this question of economy back home and must spend the taxpayers' money judicially, but the Government employees pay taxes as well as others. They pay high rents and they

pay the high prices for food and everything else. If they have a piece of property they pay the taxes the same as other property owners, so they are not in any different category in that respect.

These gentlemen in the Bureau of Animal Industry are discriminated against in many respects in the service. For instance, they only get 15 days' sick leave a year, even though injured in the performance of duty. Other Government employees get 30 days. When they are compelled to work overtime, as they are frequently obliged to do, they have to pay for their extra meals. They can not be reimbursed by the Government. When they are transferred from one station to another, that is to say, from one town or district to another, they must pay for the transportation of their families. And the work in the Bureau of Animal Industry necessitates frequent transfer of employees within the service.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that they pay their own railroad fare?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; only for their families. They are allowed transportation for themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. You said from one plant to another. Do they get traveling expenses?

Mr. RUSSELL. I meant from one district to another. A man, for instance, in the bureau is stationed at New York and is ordered to Chicago. He receives railroad fare for himself but not for his family. They have absolutely no guaranty of promotion. You gentlemen have given the great body of the post-office people such a guaranty. These post-office employees have something to look forward to, for you have authorized a definite promotion for them. The head of the department makes an estimate in accordance with the law and you give him the money under your various appropriation measures. If you pass a measure authorizing this automatic promotion, the Secretary of Agriculture will make his annual estimate and the money will be appropriated in the proper bill. The Secretary has had additional money to spend each year, it is true, but he found it necessary to increase the force, and thus could not promote these men. That is why it is necessary for this Congress to fix these salaries. If you leave it to the discretion of the head of the department how this money is to be spent it is inevitable that it will be spent in some other way. I know one department where an increase was authorized by Congress, and the increase authorized was half a million dollars, and it was all used for creating a new division. Not a dollar went to the men for whom the law was enacted. It is done absolutely within the law. You give the Secretary a lump-sum appropriation, so much money to spend, and it is going to be spent in a way that will not inure to the benefit of the individuals it is intended for unless you so specify.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM P. BORLAND, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to commend very strongly to the committee the favorable consideration of this bill. The work of the Bureau of Animal Industry is comparatively so new and has been growing at such a rapid pace and the demand for it by the American public and from the interests that have developed has been so great that it has expanded very

rapidly, and that is an indication of the importance it is to the people of this country.

The figures put in the record by Mr. Lobeck show a remarkable expansion of this Bureau of Animal Industry, especially since the act creating that permanent fund of \$3,000,000 was passed. The department has been put to it to meet the demands of that expansion. I know this to be a fact; they have not been able to reclassify the employees and put them upon a permanent basis, which ought to be done if you believe from investigation and experience there is necessity for it. The bureau has been compelled to keep them practically on the basis at which they entered the service and use the funds as largely as possible for the immediate and imperative department expansion service.

Now, this bill undertakes to classify these employees, which I think is a very proper and desirable thing to do. It undertakes further to fix the minimum salary and the grade of promotion, which I think is absolutely just and ought to be done. I think a man when he enters the service ought to see promotion ahead of him; that with a good record and continued experience he will receive certain promotion up to a point that the Government feels is right. That is the main purpose of this bill.

Now, the bill covers not only the veterinarians, but it covers the meat inspectors, inspectors' assistants, stock examiners, skilled laborers, and clerks. It covers the Bureau of Animal Industry in all its branches, in which are now included the stock on the hoof, the killing process, and the inspection of the meat clear up to the point where it goes out into interstate commerce.

The work that is done by these men in the packing houses is very arduous, under very difficult and sometimes very unpleasant conditions, and at very hard, laborious hours. Their hours are different from any other class of Government employees I know of, more irregular and more arduous. The veterinarians, who must be men of the highest skill, are there on the killing bed, inspecting the carcasses as they come fresh with the blood on them, and they inspect them up to the time they are severed and are placed in the cooling room or in the process of manufacture. They must be men not only of the highest skill, but of the quickest intelligence and the most earnest up-to-the-minute attention to their business. The department exercises a very strict control over these men. It not only requires men of the best experience and highest character and the greatest diligence, but it then holds them up to that standard. A mistake on the part of these men is a very important matter to the public. They inspect the heart and the lungs and the interior organs, the head and nasal vessels, and so on, of these animals. If the disease is there and they miss it, it is a matter of grave importance to the public, and three mistakes of that kind are practically fatal to the job of the man in the service. When he is standing there hour after hour, in the midst of blood and water and unpleasant temperatures, it is a strain unquestionably upon the man's ability, and yet these men meet it, and meet it in a large number of cases successfully.

When the carcasses go into the process of manufacture these inspectors take charge of it. These meat inspectors are men experienced in the curing of meat for consumption, and they must find in that meat not only the evidence of disease in the live animals but

they must find the evidence of bad curing or bad manufacture in every stage of the meat. They must do it carefully and quickly. They must stick their forks into the meat and tell by the sense of smell whether that meat is going to putrefy in a limited time, and they must know it is sound and wholesome before it goes into interstate commerce. And I say, very little excuse is accepted from these men for anything that gets by them. It is the most exacting business I know of, and I want to emphasize, if I have not already done so, the importance this thing bears to the American public. I believe if there is anything the American public will support it is a thoroughly high-grade inspection of these meats that go into interstate commerce, and you gentlemen are well justified in taking that fact into consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. If you will permit me, in that connection I would like to call your attention to the fact, in order that the record may be entirely clear on that point, that the committee last year allowed for increases an appropriation of \$200,000, and there were 964 men promoted. Dr. Melvin in his statement before the committee said if we would allow him \$100,000 this year, which the committee did allow, that out of that fund he would promote from 275 to 400 men, and I want to ask you in that connection how you differentiate the policy as affecting your meat inspectors from the policy of the department in reference to its other scientific work? You know, of course, that all the scientists of the Department of Agriculture are carried in a lump fund, just as these inspectors are now carried in a lump fund. Do you see any distinction between the two classes of men? The fact is, a veterinarian must be a scientist, and the inspector is naturally a technical man.

Mr. BORLAND. I do see a distinction. I think it is analogous to the postal service. I think a man gains in experience year after year, and I believe, as Mr. Russell said, it is not a good business policy for Uncle Sam to drive out of the service experienced men. A man may serve but two or three years, but as soon as he becomes experienced and knows he can transact that business he is very likely, if he is a good man, to seek employment elsewhere unless there is promotion open for him. I found that in the postal service when we put them on an automatic promotion, based on a good record—because it must be the good record that entitles them to promotion—it eliminates the idea of favoritism, not only the actual effect of favoritism, but the idea of it, and gives a man an absolute right, based on his own record, of promotion, I think that is true. I know out of lump sums scientists are paid, and these scientists are largely engaged in investigations and special work of that kind, and it is growing from year to year. You will find the meat inspection and the Bureau of Animal Industry is more analogous to the postal service than these scientific investigations, the appropriations for which are carried in a lump sum. The only objection I have to this bill, or suggestion to make is this—

Mr. SLOAN (interposing). Do you not weaken your proposition by comparing it to the postal service? Do not the men who are in the meat inspection work require more skill and ability than is required in the postal service, and is the service itself less desirable than the postal service?

Mr. BORLAND. I think it is much less desirable, in some ways, than the postal service. I would not make the comparison you speak of.

Mr. SLOAN. It takes a longer study to equip themselves for it?

Mr. BORLAND. I do not think that would be an argument in favor of leaving them in the uncertainty of a lump-sum basis. I think it would be more satisfactory to the men in the service to know when they start in that there is promotion ahead of them.

Mr. SLOAN. You do not get my proposition. In comparing it to the postal service, do you not weaken your proposition? Are they not entitled to much more consideration than the postal service employees, because the postal men are not required to be graduates, and if there is anything in the comparison it is much stronger in favor of these men than it is for the postal men?

Mr. BORLAND. I thought I made it clear that my comparison only extends to the work of the postal service and that done by the scientific investigators, for whom appropriations are paid in a lump sum. But as to the comparison of the work of the postal service and the packing-house service, I think there are a great many disadvantages in the latter that are not to be found in the former service.

Mr. HELGESEN. Is it not a fact that there are no other employees of the Government anywhere upon whom the welfare of the Nation depends as much as on these Bureau of Animal Industry employees?

Mr. BORLAND. That is the great point. They are held to a very high degree of responsibility, and the people demand it and have a right to demand it. There is this about it, which I want to say in answer to Mr. Sloan: The present system has resulted, if I have not been misinformed, in great inequalities in different parts of the country among different employees. Some of them do practically the same work, but at lower pay. These inequalities ought to be reconciled. They are doing substantially the same grade of work, but receive different salaries. It would be a matter of satisfaction to remedy that. In that way I compare it to the postal service.

Mr. SLOAN. Why should this committee fix it?

Mr. BORLAND. That question can be answered in only one way in regard to the Government service. A man in charge of a private corporation can perhaps get better service by going out and paying for it, and he pays the prices he wants to pay and picks out the men he wants; that argument would lead to the result of abolishing the civil service if we applied it strictly, but we found that argument does not logically follow with the Federal employee. It does not work out. It is absolutely essential, with the enormous body of men that we have, that we have satisfactory salaries, and we have graded the positions, and the men have that as a right when they enter the service. That is what keeps the men contented.

Mr. REILLY. If the committee should pass this bill is it necessary that all employees would have to fall under the same rule?

Mr. BORLAND. Not necessarily; yet if there were any other branch of the service where conditions exist that exist in the meat inspection, I think the result ought to follow. I have made this point to the committee, that this work has expanded now until it is a permanent part of the governmental activities, permanent and expanding, just as permanent and expanding as the postal department, and therefore

it ought to be put on a permanent and expanding basis. It ought to be taken out of what was the experimental stage.

Mr. REILLY. Is not the whole Agricultural Department on a permanent and expanding basis?

Mr. BORLAND. No, sir; much of it is purely on an investigation basis; a great deal of it.

Mr. REILLY. It is expanding.

Mr. BORLAND. A great deal is on an investigation basis. When that becomes a permanent fixture in our governmental activities, you would then insist upon this same classification.

Mr. SLOAN. Do you think it would be fair to pay the inspectors at Kansas City and Chicago, who put in long hours every day, the same salaries as those paid in the smaller packing houses, where they put in only two or three hours a day?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I can not say it would be. I had an interview with Dr. Melvin the other day, and he was going to send a man to some point in Virginia, and I looked up the place and found there were 600 people in that town, and that was what was called a processing house in that town. The killing was not done there. I think you will have to classify the establishments in some way, and Dr. Melvin can do it very easily under this bill.

Mr. SLOAN. Is that provided for in this bill?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I think it is. I think the law would adapt itself to that. I think you ought not to pay a man working in a large packing house the same salary you would pay a man in the small packing house. There is bound to be a great difference in the amount of work done.

Mr. SLOAN. My understanding is that inspectors are detailed to do work in establishments that kill only a day or two a week.

Mr. BORLAND. That does not occur in big establishments.

Mr. SLOAN. They work all the time?

Mr. BORLAND. There are some establishments where the work is continuous, and then there are others that are practically on the basis of fourth-class post offices. I was going to suggest in regard to the bill that I have not talked to any of the people about it directly to see how this range of salaries suited. I do not think \$2,400 as a maximum for a veterinarian is too great. I think a good veterinarian, after he has been with the Government 10 years, is worth \$2,400, and could very easily make that on the outside.

Mr. HAUGEN. Right there, in order that we may get this salary proposition cleared up, I wish to call your attention to the fact that there is only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent difference in the amount urged under this bill and the estimate submitted by Dr. Melvin and the bill reported by this committee, and I call your attention to that simply to point out that, in my opinion, any criticism of the department or Congress is not well founded. The fact is there is only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent difference in the estimate made by the department and the appropriation made by Congress and the amount asked for by the employees themselves.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Haugen, I was not making that as a criticism of the department. I was saying this range of salaries is not high, and they seem to be moderate and fair for this class of work.

Mr. LOBECK. From the letters that I am receiving from all over the country, it would seem that these salaries do not show high.

Mr. BORLAND. The salaries of the meat inspectors, I think, are a little low, and I am going to make the suggestion that I think they should run from \$1,000 to \$2,000. I think the maximum of the salaries of the meat inspectors should be \$2,000, and the reason I make that suggestion is this: The meat inspectors are not to be compared with any other class of employees. Where they fit in on the program they are practically standing there as umpires between the people on the one side and the employees and superintendents of the packing houses who receive all the way from \$2,500 to \$7,000 on the other. Those who have been promoted as expert meat inspectors are the men representing the consumer and the Government pays them from \$1,000 to \$1,600, and the packer pays his men, the men representing the packer, anywhere from \$3,000 to \$7,000. These expert meat inspectors must be experienced and diligent men.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is true in the large establishments.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; and I think there might be, without any injustice to the Government, an increase in the maximum of the meat inspectors to \$2,000.

Mr. REILLY. Do you think a salary of \$2,000 would hold them

Mr. BORLAND. I think it would keep them in the service longer. I think that \$1,600 might tend to keep the experienced and accurate men out of our employ and drive them to private employment. We can not afford to pay or promise to pay in the Government service the highest scale of wages that are paid for that service in private employment to a man of unusual skill. I understand, of course, that Government salaries are never as high as the most successful men in private employment. We can not say because a man of unusual experience and diligence and capacity for work in his line can command \$10,000 in private employment that we can put our figures on that basis in the Federal employment. We don't pay our judges or Cabinet officers what they could command in private life. We put the figures always below—not more than 50 per cent of what he ought to be able to earn in private employment for the highest skill in his business. But when you come to a business like the postal business or this business where men have worked in it for 10 years or more and have become experienced in it, it is not to the interest of these men or to the Government that they get out. It is to the interest of the Government that they stay in, and the salaries ought to be at least adequate to induce them to stay in. It is easy enough to get a man to enter the service, but after that man gets middle-aged, with the responsibilities of family and citizenship, he can not always get out and try another business; he is tied to his job. Fairness means that we have some range of salaries not too high, as against private, employment, and yet high enough to keep the men.

Mr. SLOAN. Do you believe the maximum and the minimum salaries fixed in this bill are equitable to the employees? Should there not be a greater entrance salary than \$840 for the veterinarian?

Mr. BORLAND. \$1,400 is the lowest and \$2,400 the highest for the veterinary inspector.

Mr. SLOAN. Is not the variation greater in establishments where they work day and night, like Chicago, and have so much more work to do than in the smaller establishments, where probably they work only a few hours a week, but the salary fixed is the same?

Mr. BORLAND. As a general thing I think this range of salaries ought to be approximately 100 per cent—that the maximum salary ought to be 100 per cent of the entrance salary.

Mr. SLOAN. Have you discussed the matter with the department?

Mr. BORLAND. I have discussed the nature of the work with them many times.

Mr. HELGESEN. Are they to have certain training before they can enter? Doctors are employed and they are required to be just as well educated in their profession as other doctors. What the Government wants is not so much that the man be well educated as that he should be able to go into an establishment and demonstrate his ability to deal with and detect disease in cattle. Experience counts more than education.

Mr. BORLAND. There is no question about that.*

Mr. LOBECK. The importance of this legislation may be measured by the keen interest manifested in the bill by prominent citizens and by local and national associations and societies in different sections of the United States. I have quite a large number of resolutions, telegrams, and letters indorsing the bill. I appreciate the fact that the Mexican war situation makes it imperative that the time consumed in these hearings be limited. Hence, I shall not impose upon your time by reading the communications, but will simply say that I have the following indorsements of H. R. 9292:

1. Telegram from F. S. Russell, secretary South Omaha, Nebr., Branch No. 16, National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, dated November 12, 1913.

2. Letter from F. S. Russell, secretary South Omaha, Nebr., Branch No. 16, National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, dated January 22, 1914, transmitting petition signed by 131 Bureau of Animal Industry employees at South Omaha, Nebr.

3. Resolutions adopted by Milwaukee Branch No. 2, National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, January 6, 1914. Signed by F. C. Krchl, president, and W. M. Hazen, secretary.

4. Resolutions adopted by the Brooklyn Branch of the United Master Butchers' Association of America, Brooklyn, N. Y., March 25, 1914.

5. April 13, 1914. The following commission firms of Fort Worth, Tex.: Daggett-Keen Commission Co.; Campbell & Rosson Live Stock Commission Co.; Evans-Snyder Buel Co.; Geo. W. Saunders Commission Co.; North Texas Live Stock Commission Co.; Geo. R. Barse Live Stock Commission Co.; C. H. Toups Commission Co.; National Live Stock Commission Co.; Frank Witherspoon Live Stock Commission Co.; Evans-Montague Commission Co.; Cassidy-Southwestern Commission Co.; T. F. Saunders & Co.; Clay Robinson & Co.; Lee Live Stock Commission Co.; Rhome-Farmer Live Stock Commission Co.; J. P. Daggett & Co.; Comet Commission Co.

6. Letter from F. S. Rickard, secretary South Omaha Business Men's Association, showing that the association voted indorsement of H. R. 9292 in regular meeting April 13, 1914.

7. Letter from E. R. Carhart, ex-president New York Produce Exchange, dated April 18, 1914.

8. Letter from Dr. C. J. Marshall, president American Veterinary Medical Association.

9. Resolutions adopted by Indianapolis Branch, No. 3, N. A. B. A. I. E., signed by the committee.

10. Letter from Dr. Wm. S. Pollard, president Alumni Association of U. S. College of Veterinary Surgeons.

11. Resolutions adopted by New York and Vicinity Branch, No. 19, N. A. B. A. I. E., at open meeting March 13, 1914, signed by Florens McCarthy, recording secretary.

12. Resolutions adopted by South St. Joseph Branch, No. 4, National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees in executive session March 11, 1914, signed by A. A. Bryan, inspector's assistant, chairman; C. I. Walsh, veterinary inspector; David Jones, meat inspector; Ensley Taylor, clerk; Wm. F. Neil, stock examiner; Dr. Howard C. Wilson, president; Frank Chaney, secretary.

13. Resolutions adopted by Washington (D. C.) Branch, No. 15, National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees on January 25, 1914, signed by Dr. F. A. Hugins, secretary.

14. Resolutions indorsed by South St. Paul Branch, No. 10, December 8, 1913, signed by Dr. Jas. S. Healy, president, and W. A. Forbes, secretary.

15. Resolutions indorsed by Pittsburgh Branch, No. 34, National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees February 7, 1914, signed by Dr. J. R. Donnelly, president; B. F. Black, secretary treasurer; Dr. H. H. Myers; Thos. Mulvey, meat inspector; and C. L. Kornegay, inspector's assistant, trustees.

16. Resolutions indorsed by St. Louis (Mo.) Branch, No. 12, National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees February 16, 1914, signed by Dr. J. F. Roser, president; E. K. Hess, secretary; and also by 47 other Bureau of Animal Industry employees.

17. Resolutions indorsed by National Stock Yards (Ill.) Branch, No. 5, National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, signed by L. S. Donham, president; Dr. A. A. Crosland, vice president; and R. M. Vanscoy, secretary.

18. Resolutions indorsed by Fort Worth (Tex.) Branch No. 6, National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, April 6, 1914. Signed by Dr. Alexander G. Fraser, president; Dr. Joseph A. Brill, secretary; Julian J. Parker, Thos. N. Veach, Jas. F. Butler, and Harry A. Peterman, committee.

20. Letter from Kansas City Branch No. 8, dated April 13, 1914. Signed by Dr. A. N. Reber, president, and F. V. Shore, secretary.

21. Resolutions adopted by Baltimore (Md.) Branch No. 32, April 15, 1914. Signed by Dr. W. S. Pollard, president; H. C. Belt, secretary.

I shall turn over these documents to the committee for their further consideration.

The following is a clipping from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of February 7, 1914:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES HEAR JUDGES—BILL IS TALKED—BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY MEN TAKE PROPOSED BILL FOR SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION.

District Judge R. H. Buck and County Civil Judge C. T. Prewett were the principal speakers Friday night at a smoker given by the Fort Worth Branch of the National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees at Googins Hall, North Main and Twentieth Streets. The speakers talked on subjects pertaining to civil service and meat inspection work.

There was a general discussion of the Lobeck bill, fixing a permanent classification of Bureau of Animal Industry employees. This bill is advocated by the bureau employees all over the United States.

Dr. A. G. Fraser, president of the Fort Worth branch, presided. The local branch has a membership of 50 veterinarians and an auxiliary in Houston with a membership of 10 veterinarians.

The committee then adjourned until Tuesday, April 21, at 10 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, April 21, 1914.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Asbury F. Lever (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. Mr. Lobeck, suppose you proceed with the case.

Mr. LOBECK. I expect to call on Drs. Moore and Ravenel. Congressman Booher would like to have a few minutes to present some letters, as he has another engagement, so I will ask him to present them now.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES F. BOOHER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as you are all are aware, there is a very large stockyards' interest and packing interest in the district which I represent, at St. Joseph, Mo. The Live Stock Exchange, situated at South St. Joseph, where the stockyards are located, on the 15th of April passed resolutions in regard to this bill, and I wish to present them and ask that they be printed in the record. They are as follows [reading]:

THE SOUTH ST. JOSEPH LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
South St. Joseph, Mo., April 15, 1914.

Whereas the attention of the South St. Joseph Live Stock Exchange has been called to H. R. bill 9292, known as the Lobeck classification bill; and

Whereas the object of this bill is to place the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, on a classified basis, the same as other employees of the various departments of the Government service, wherein merit and service will be recognized and rewarded, thus securing to this department the best available men: Therefore be it

Resolved, By the South St. Joseph Live Stock Exchange, in special session this date assembled, that we indorse the above-named bill and urge upon Congress the justice and necessity of its passage, for the betterment of this department, that is so closely allied with the interests of the whole people of the country.

[SEAL.]

M. F. BLANCHARD, *President*,
E. F. ERWIN, *Sec. retary*.

On April 17, the Commerce Club of St. Joseph, Mo., sent me this letter, which I will read. (Reading:)

COMMERCE CLUB OF ST. JOSEPH, MO.,
April 17, 1914.

HON. CHARLES F. BOOHER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The Commerce Club of St. Joseph, Mo., indorses the provisions of the Lobeck classification bill (H. R. 9292) and respectfully urge that you use all your influence to secure its passage by Congress.

Yours, truly,

COMMERCE CLUB,
By R. M. BACHELLER, *President*.
H. D. ENNIS, *Secretary*.

Now, gentlemen, I have received numerous letters during the past three years from employees in the meat-inspection service of the Government, especially stock examiners and inspectors, complaining that they have not received the promotions to which they were entitled, and which had been promised them when they entered the service. I have taken that matter up several times with Secretary Wilson, and since that time with Dr. Galloway in the present administration, and their reply always was, "Yes, these men are entitled to promotion, but we have not the money. There is no money to pay it." Now, it seems to me that if these men when they entered the service were promised promotions for efficiency, these promises ought to be carried out, and that is what I believe the Lobeck bill proposes to do, to classify these salaries and duties.

Now, there is one thing on this that I want to call to the attention of this committee and that is what is known as the traveling inspector, who goes about this country inspecting the work of these men engaged in the meat-inspection service. At every one of these big centers—these big stock centers—they have a chief of the bureau.

Mr. HELGESEN. I would like to ask you, did the Secretary of Agriculture say to you that these men were entitled to promotion and had not been given it because they did not have the money?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; that is the only reason he ever gave me, that the reason these men were not promoted was because funds were not furnished to pay the additional salary.

Now, I can not see the use of the traveling inspector. It seems to me that these men who are there in charge of these bureaus—for instance, take the bureau at Kansas City, or at Omaha, or at St. Joseph—I am familiar with all of them, and the men at the head of those bureaus are thoroughly qualified to discharge the duties of the positions, and if they are not they ought not to have them there; but when the department has done that, it does seem to me as though these men ought not to be subject to the inspection of some fellow who travels around the country only as an expert in that business. It seems to me that a saving could be made to the department by striking out these traveling inspectors and put the duties of that place upon the head of the agents at that station and see that he performs his duty. I have often asked the head of the bureau when they had instituted these inspectors, "You say these inspectors are necessary; now, tell me who inspects them? Who knows anything about what they do when they go to these places?" You know nothing about it except what they report to you, and I think they are an absolutely unnecessary appendage to this department and ought not to be tolerated any longer; that the men in charge of this work at the places are the men who ought to be responsible for it, and if they are not qualified to fill the places they ought to be removed and qualified men put in their places, and you could save a good many hundred thousand dollars by wiping out the traveling inspectors.

Mr. MAGUIRE. How would you get your connection from those who are always on the ground out there to the ones who are always on the ground here?

Mr. BOOHER. Can they not report to the bureau?

Mr. MAGUIRE. You mean a written report?

Mr. BOOHER. A written report; yes. They can make a written report of the conditions of affairs to the Secretary of Agriculture just as well as the inspectors can, can they not?

Mr. MAGUIRE. Yes, I suppose so.

Mr. BOOHER. Did you ever know an inspector, either in the live-stock business, or in the pension or in the post-office business, who ever went to any place to inspect, except to make trouble for somebody there? If you have, you have seen a different class of inspectors from those I have seen.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I was not complaining one way or the other on that matter, but I merely wanted to know how you were going to get that information to the bureau heads.

Mr. BOOHER. Could you not get it from the chief in charge at Omaha, or St. Joseph, or Kansas City?

Mr. MAGUIRE. He must get it from somebody else.

Mr. BOOHER. Would he not get it himself from his employees there, and know himself the manner in which the business was conducted? Is it not his duty now, the duty of the chief, to go into the meat inspection department, and see whether the men there are

competent and qualified, and see whether they are doing their duty as it ought to be done? If he finds that the work is not being done, it is his duty to correct it.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Your objection is, as I understand it, to traveling inspectors?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. MAGUIRE. You do not have any objection at all to real inspection?

Mr. BOOHER. No; but I would have the chief, wherever the man is located, to do the inspecting. He is there to do this work, and why should somebody else be sent there to inspect him?

Mr. MAGUIRE. That would be all right in large plants, but in smaller places where there are only a few inspectors, you could not afford to keep a chief inspector there.

Mr. BOOHER. You have one, haven't you, at the head of the service?

Mr. MAGUIRE. But what would you do about those smaller places?

Mr. BOOHER. The inspector is qualified to take care of the business at that place.

Mr. MAGUIRE. There are places where there are only one or two or three inspectors. You would not want to keep a chief inspector there?

Mr. BOOHER. You would not put a man where there are only two or three men—the department would not use a man to inspect the products of that establishment unless he was thoroughly qualified to inspect it. Now, if he is qualified to inspect the output of that establishment, he is qualified, in my judgment, to make any report necessary to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very glad to have heard you, Mr. Booher.

Mr. LOBECK. The following telegram has just been received:

OMAHA, NEBR., April 21, 1914.

HON. C. O. LOBECK,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Following resolutions adopted by Commercial Club to-day:

Resolved, That the Commercial Club of Omaha indorses House bill 9292, introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Lobbeck November 14, 1913, because of belief that said bill is for the best interests of the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture and of the packing industry, as the bill places the employees in a more permanent status of service and promotion through merit.

Resolved further, That the congressional delegation of Nebraska be notified of this request by the Commercial Club.

COMMERCIAL CLUB OF OMAHA,

C. E. YOST, *President*.

J. L. McCAGUE, *Chairman Executive Committee*.

If our inspection system should be allowed to deteriorate and any of our diseased meats or live stock enter into foreign commerce, there is the grave danger that foreign countries would lose confidence in our system of inspection and would enact such rigid inspection requirements on their own part as to virtually prohibit our meat and meat-food products from being imported into those countries, and might also refuse to accept the certificates of the United States to accompany cattle, sheep, swine, and goats to foreign countries. (See sec. 5, Regulation 25 of B. A. I. order 150; also Regulation 1 of B. A. I. order 139.)

The Argentine Republic is very strict in its requirements for the entry of live stock, and all shipments of such should receive proper

inspection, including the tuberculin test in case of cattle, by trained men of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, with a view to upholding the reputation of our stock for health as well as quality. The same applies to shipments to South Africa and other countries.

Both Canada and Mexico have regulations providing for the tuberculin testing, by inspectors of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, of cattle imported into those countries from the United States.

Canada also makes provision for the acceptance of mallein test certificates accompanying horses from this country when such are signed or indorsed by an inspector of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry.

Great Britain has an order in effect that horses, asses, and mules brought to that country from abroad are to be accompanied by a veterinary certificate of freedom from symptoms of glanders (including farcy), epizootic lymphangitis, ulcerative lymphangitis, dourine, horse-pox, sarcoptic mange, psoroptic mange, influenza, ringworm, or strangles, and there is apparently more or less demand in that country that such certificate be issued by a veterinary inspector in the United States Bureau of Animal Industry.

It is therefore extremely important that the Bureau of Animal Industry be enabled to enlist the services of a high class of men for this work that is of such vital importance to the Nation from a commercial and a sanitary viewpoint.

To further emphasize the importance of having reliable and capable and trained men employed in the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, your attention is directed to section 5, regulation 25, Bureau of Animal Industry order No. 150, regulations governing the meat inspection of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, which reads as follows:

SEC. 5. No master of any steam or sailing vessel shall receive for transportation or transport from the United States to Great Britain or Ireland, or any of the countries of continental Europe, or to Argentina or Mexico, any carcass, part of carcass, or meat food product of cattle, sheep, swine, or goats, except ship stores, unless and until a certificate of inspection covering the same has been issued and delivered as provided in this regulation, etc.

The certificate of inspection, as indicated above is also required in the instance of shipments to Peru and the French Antilles, and the Canadian Government provides that meat food products entering that country from the United States shall bear the inspection stamp of the United States Department of Agriculture.

The following letters show the dangers to which the Bureau of Animal Industry employees are exposed in the line of duty:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, March 25, 1914.

HON. C. O. LOBECK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, requesting to be furnished with a list of the diseases communicable from animals to men.

These diseases may be classified under two headings: (1) Diseases of animals which are contracted by man only from animals. (2) Human diseases which may be contracted by man from animals.

In the first group may be mentioned the following: Actinomycosis, anthrax, botryomycosis, echinococcus disease, foot-and-mouth disease, glanders, Malta fever, rabies,

Rocky Mountain spotted fever, tapeworm diseases, trichinosis, and vaccinia. Plague, primarily a disease of rodents, may also be included in this class.

Some of these diseases are transmitted by close contact with the infected animal; others, as plague and Rocky Mountain spotted fever, by means of insect hosts; and others, as Malta fever and trichinosis, by the use of animal products as food.

To the second group belong such diseases as diphtheria, favus, ringworm, septic sore throat, and tuberculosis.

Respectfully,

RUPERT BLUE, *Surgeon General.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, March 24, 1914.

Hon. C. O. LOBECK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In response to your letter of the 20th instant, I desire to state that the term "erysipeloid" is applied to an inflammation of the skin, usually affecting the fingers and hands of meat dressers, fish dealers, poultry cleaners, and persons of similar occupations. This disease is supposed to be due to the absorption of putrescent animal matter by the skin. Some authors think that the source of this disease is a micro-organism existing in putrid flesh and cheese.

Respectfully,

RUPERT BLUE, *Surgeon General.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 16, 1914.*

Hon. C. O. LOBECK.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your recent communication, I beg to state that the following skin diseases may be transferred from animals to man, and that those employed around dairy farms, packing houses, and stockyards are apt to be infected:

I. Tuberculosis of the skin, usually in a mild form, but sometimes of a very severe character. I have had several cases under my care.

II. Ringworm, which is not severe.

III. Sporotrichosis, which may or may not be severe.

IV. Foot-and-mouth disease, which usually ends favorably.

V. Acute septic pemphigus, which almost invariably ends fatally.

VI. Erysipeloid, which is a mild disease.

VII. Anthrax, which is a very serious ailment.

VIII. Glanders, which is usually fatal.

IX. Actinomycosis, which is often fatal.

In addition, mild infections of the skin are common, and there is a possibility that blastomycosis may be derived from cattle. A recent case in Washington in a member of the Bureau of Animal Industry would suggest this origin.

Yours, very truly,

H. H. HAZEN, M. D.

I will now call on Dr. V. A. Moore, director of New York State Veterinary College, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.; chairman of committee on diseases, American Veterinary Medical Association; vice president United States Live Stock Sanitary Association; member American Public Health Association.

STATEMENT OF DR. V. A. MOORE, DIRECTOR NEW YORK STATE VETERINARY COLLEGE, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, N. Y.

Dr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been requested to present certain matters to the committee in regard to the inspection service in connection with this bill before you.

I wish to say in the first place that I feel, and those whom I personally represent feel, that the bill should be amended slightly, unless it

is so intended in its wording that these promotions shall be made on efficiency as well as on length of service. That is, if a man is not efficient, he has no claim upon this automatic promotion. This was discussed yesterday, and I simply wish to bring it to your attention again, because I believe it is the feeling of the inspectors throughout the country that promotions should be based primarily on efficiency as well as on length of service.

The employees of the bureau whom I personally represent desire that promotions shall be based upon merit. At a recent meeting of these employees in the city of Buffalo a resolution was passed asking that the bill be in this respect amended. This I feel is right and just to all concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. If you put that provision in the bill, would you not destroy absolutely the effect of the bill? In other words, would you not bring this right back to the present system?

Dr. MOORE. Well, I would not want to do that, but I understood there is objection to the bill because of this automatic promotion, regardless of efficiency, and I wish to sustain the point by having efficiency made a part of it, so that a man who was inefficient and who did not keep his work up to a certain point would not be entitled to it.

The CHAIRMAN. If I understand the theory of the bill, it is this: You require automatic promotion of these employees for the purpose of taking out of the hands of those in charge a discretion which they now exercise in the line of efficiency. Now, then, if you are going to base your promotion upon efficiency, you would bring your bill right back to the present situation, it seems to me.

Mr. HELGESEN. Is it not a matter of fact that efficiency is the basis upon which promotions are made, and after a man's efficiency has been established, he remains in the service as long as he is sufficiently satisfactory, but when he is not he can be removed?

Dr. MOORE. I do not know about removals, but I believe that the inspectors feel that the whole performance of their duty is to be taken into account, and if a man is not efficient, if he lies down on his job, so to speak, he would not be entitled to this promotion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that not the situation now?

Dr. MOORE. Well, the situation now is that they are not promoted because of lack of funds, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. Nine hundred and sixty-four were promoted last year, and I think it is proposed under the present appropriation passed by this committee to promote about three or four hundred more; and in the course of 10 years, the life of your bill, if this committee should give the increase that it has been giving for the last two years, we would have given you as much money as you are asking for in your bill, and all the promotions would be made.

Dr. MOORE. If these promotions are made as guaranteed to the men, I think that is the purpose of this bill.

Mr. LOBECK. Was not the \$100,000 to be appropriated this year to be used for other purposes?

The CHAIRMAN. \$25,000 to \$50,000 of the increase is to be used for additional inspection work; \$50,000 to \$75,000 is to be used for the promotion of employees, and in the expenditure of that amount Dr. Melvin says that between 275 and 400 employees will be promoted. That is his statement before this committee.

Mr. LOBECK. I understand that about \$75,000 is to be used for the inspection of meats imported from foreign countries.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not his statement. His statement is that the amount proposed to be expended for promotions in the year 1915 is from \$50,000 to \$75,000, and the amount designed for extension of inspection service in 1915 is \$25,000 to \$50,000. You will find that on page 64 of the hearings before this committee on the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. HELGESEN. Did we not give them practically everything that they asked for?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HELGESEN. Then why should they say that the only reason that they did not promote these men was that they did not have the money, when they got all the money that they asked for?

Mr. LOBECK. I understand that this matter of importations developed later, since these hearings were held.

Mr. HAWLEY. No; the importation is mentioned in there.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it is one of the reasons for the use of \$25,000.

Dr. MOORE. I think, Mr. Chairman, a good deal of this money has had to be used in inspection. Establishments have been springing up requiring inspection, and the Government has been required to furnish these new inspectors, and I suppose that has reduced the amount of money available for promotions.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me say in reference to that situation, because the committee is very anxious to do justice to these 2,800 men employed in this service, the Department of Agriculture, if your statement of facts is correct, has had an opportunity within the last few weeks to present its estimates for an increase in appropriations to the Senate committee, but it has not done so.

Dr. MOORE. I do not know anything about that, sir.

Mr. HAUGEN. I might add also, Mr. Chairman, that Congress provided for the inspection work to the amount of \$1,800,000 in the last three years. We have always given them everything they asked for.

Mr. HAWLEY. And now the appropriation for this department has gone up to \$3,200,000, which Congress has been providing for by additional appropriations.

Dr. MOORE. But at the time, as I understand it, that that bill was passed, when the \$3,000,000 was appropriated, there were only 163 establishments requiring inspection, whereas in the year 1913 there were 910 establishments in 251 cities and towns.

Mr. HAUGEN. But the estimate was that the \$3,000,000 would take care of it for all time to come, an annual appropriation. But the business has expanded to more than \$3,000,000 and now recurring appropriations have been made year by year based on the estimates of the department.

Dr. MOORE. Now, the efficiency of the meat inspection service is of great importance to the country. It is the basis for our export trade.

Mr. HAUGEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me, I believe we are familiar with the character of this work. There is no question as to that. The question before this committee now is, Shall the salaries be classified, or will we go on in the way we have been doing in the past? Which is to the better interest of the fellow employed, to continue as we have been doing and leave it to the discretion of the

bureau to fix the salaries, or shall Congress fix salaries as indicated in this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is a very good suggestion that Mr. Haugen has made, and it will expedite this hearing very greatly if that is followed. There is not a member of the committee that does not believe in the efficiency of the service. What we want to know is, what you gentlemen are driving at, what you want, and what you want it for?

Mr. SLOAN. In that connection, I want to inquire whether those in favor of the bill as suggested here, instead of having a standard of time service, want to inject at this time the double standard of time service and efficiency. If that is so, it would be a very good idea for those in charge of the bill to show how that double standard can be injected into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I think that states it very well, and it will save a great deal of time if you gentlemen will confine yourselves to statements along those lines.

Dr. MOORE. I believe that the salaries should be scheduled and that there should be at least a minimum and maximum salary fixed, and probably this arrangement, this double standard which the gentleman suggests, seems to me to be desirable and would work out for the best interests of the service. Now, in addition to the necessity of this efficient service, we have to consider some of the objectionable features in the work that these men have to do. In the first place the veterinary inspectors have to spend three years' time in a college and before they enter college many of them have to spend four years in a high school preparing themselves, so that they have to devote a total of seven years to their education besides the expenditure of a good many hundred dollars. The amount varies in different veterinary schools from \$1,400 to \$2,000 in actual money, in addition to the time and cost for preparing them for this work. They have to become familiar with the conditions involved in the treatment of various diseases of animals, and various complications that arise in connection with the nature of disease, in order to be able to pass upon the different points.

Mr. HELGESEN. Do you think, in the case of these animals, that it would be safe to allow anyone but a veterinarian to decide upon the wholesomeness of the product as food?

Dr. MOORE. Well, I do not think anyone is competent to pass upon the carcass of an animal that is suffering from any disease except a person who is qualified by studying the nature of those diseases. Now, the veterinarian at the present time is the only man in this country who has the training in the specific subjects that qualifies him to pass upon that subject.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Now, you have spoken about the preparation of the veterinarians. Of course there are two or three or four divisions there. What about the preparation of the other men, the meat inspectors, and the others mentioned in this bill? What preparation have they got to have, and what examination, etc., have they got to pass before they can enter the service?

Dr. MOORE. I think their technical examination is not very extended. They must have practical knowledge of the preservation of meat. The veterinarian deals with the diseases and condition of the flesh as it is in the carcass at the time of slaughter. The meat in-

spector deals with the condition of the meat at the time it is shipped and placed upon the market for the consumer. He has to deal with the question of the curing of meat and the decompositions of various kinds that may take place; and he has to see that it is wholesome, that it has been properly pickled, or smoked, or cured, to see that it comes out in proper condition for consumption. Their training is of a practical nature.

Mr. MAGUIRE. They are practical men, not scientific men?

Dr. MOORE. Not scientific men; no, sir.

Now, there are certain conditions attending the veterinarian inspection that we ought to understand. The first is that the veterinarians are dealing with diseased animals constantly. They are handling the diseased parts—the healthy parts they do not have to consider so much—and they are subject to infection by tuberculosis, anthrax, and blood poison. Now, there are a number of other diseases reported to have been contracted by meat inspectors, but they are not from animals. However, we know of a good many tuberculosis cases, one or two of anthrax, and a good many of blood poisoning that have been contracted; some men have died as a result of it, and others have been permanently injured, principally from blood poison, resulting in the loss of one or more fingers. Then, they are obliged to work in places that are entirely unpleasant. They are obliged to go from rooms that are warm, 80 to 100 degrees, to the cooler, where it is near the freezing point, and sometimes much below freezing, nearly to zero—and working in these damp places, on slippery floors, and being obliged to go, as many of them are, from warm rooms to cold rooms, is not conducive to good health. There is also danger from machinery and from animals falling from the rails.

Mr. MOSS. Will you permit a question there?

Dr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSS. Are the inspectors themselves subject to any greater degree of these perils and disabilities than the workmen that do the slaughtering?

Dr. MOORE. In some respects they are. In some of these conditions the men on the floor, the butchers, of course, have the same conditions of slippery floors and damp atmosphere, and all that the inspectors have, but the butchers are not obliged to slice up or work with the diseased parts as much as the inspectors are. The danger of infection to the butcher is not so great as it is to the inspector.

Mr. MOSS. Now, take the average butcher; would he be probably as well able to take care of himself to avoid infection as would an inspector, and would he have as much time to protect himself?

Dr. MOORE. He would have as much time. The veterinary inspector should be qualified to disinfect any cuts that he might receive, better than the butcher would. When a butcher is injured in the large plants he is sent to the company's physician at the company's expense. There is no similar provision for the inspectors, inspectors' assistants, stock examiners, etc.

Mr. HELGESEN. Is it not a matter of fact that the cheapest thing in America to-day is common labor, and if you attempt to put skilled labor on the basis of common labor you could not get any work at all?

Dr. MOORE. No, sir; you could not do it.

Mr. HAUGEN. You could not get skilled labor to do it.

Mr. HELGESEN. Inspectors ought to be skilled.

Mr. HAUGEN. They are, but if nobody employed them, what would they do?

Mr. HELGESEN. There are other things that they can do. A man would not take a chance on his life for a small amount, if he has enough education to make a living at something else.

Dr. MOORE. Now, another very important matter, it seems to me, in this inspection work, is the transfer of men from one place to another. While that seems to be necessary in maintaining efficiency in the service, I do not think it can be prevented, but it imposes great hardships upon these men. They are not allowed—that is, it is not safe for them to endeavor to have a home, and they can not settle into a community as a permanent citizen, and they lead the life of transients to a very great extent. That is all right for a young man, but after a man is married and has a family, as it is the desire of most men to have, and he is obliged to go from place to place and move his furniture—and while the Government may pay his expenses from point to point, and while it may pay a certain amount of transportation for his furniture, it does not pay the wear and tear that he loses, it does not pay transportation for his family, and does not pay freight charges on his furniture in excess of 3,500 pounds in weight, and it is a condition that most men do not like to consider.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Have you any figures on the number of transfers made in a year? That would be interesting.

Dr. MOORE. Dr. Walkley has that number. I was in Buffalo a short time ago at a meeting where there were about 20, and only four of them had been there over five years.

The CHAIRMAN. You are reciting these facts as an argument here why we ought to increase the salaries of these inspectors and veterinarians?

Dr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. This bill does not attempt to provide against transfers from place to place, does it?

Dr. MOORE. No, sir; but the fact that this service requires these transfers, denies a man the privilege of becoming a permanent citizen, you might say, in a community, certainly entitles him to some consideration.

Mr. HAUGEN. You are not opposing it in the bill?

Dr. MOORE. No, it can not be helped. I think the bureau is doing everything it can to make it as easy for the men as the efficiency of the service permits, but it does require that these men be transferred from one place to another, on account of existing conditions, and that transfer necessarily is expensive.

Mr. HAUGEN. Are these transfers along special lines? That is to say, probably from smaller establishments to larger ones?

Dr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. In accordance with demonstrated efficiency, and may that not have accounted for the change from Buffalo to larger places, such as Chicago, Omaha, and Kansas City?

Dr. MOORE. Yes; it might.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is in the end an advancement, is it not, where they are taken from smaller places to larger places?

Dr. MOORE. That is not often the case, because there is no more compensation, and the duties and responsibilities are as great there.

Mr. HAUGEN. But the larger place is more desirable, is it not?

Dr. MOORE. Not always.

Mr. HAUGEN. What is the rule about that?

Dr. MOORE. Well, I think the rule is that the bureau puts the best man in that particular place. If they have a man in Buffalo who they think can handle a situation that exists in St. Joseph or any other place, they will put the man over there.

Mr. HAWLEY. Transfer to a larger place might really be a detriment to a man, because it might cost him more to live there than it would at the smaller place.

Dr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. LOBECK. I will have to ask that Dr. Moore be permitted to proceed with his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. I was about to suggest that Dr. Moore should be allowed to proceed without interruption, because the Members desire to be on the floor by half past 12.

Mr. SLOAN. I would suggest to Mr. Lobeck that the members of the committee are more interested in hearing the particular points that really characterize this question than they are in a long discussion of the merits of the question.

The CHAIRMAN. I think if you will state just exactly what you want in this bill, and how the bill differs from the present arrangement in the Bureau of Animal Industry, how it would be an improvement both for the service and the men themselves, that is what we are after. That is the point we are driving at. I may say that, not to cut you gentlemen off, but we have a situation here which you realize, and that is the question of time.

Dr. MOORE. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this bill should be passed, in order that the men may know when they go into the service what they can expect. These men, the veterinary inspectors particularly, when they graduate and are eligible for these positions are also eligible to go into practice and are eligible for other positions which pay on an average more salary than the bureau does. The inference was when this present law went into effect that they would be promoted from time to time, but now they are beginning to see that the promotions are not being made, and the best men are leaving the service. The efficiency of the service is being deteriorated because of the loss of the most efficient and best men. These men are leaving the service where they are getting \$1,400 to take positions that pay \$1,800 and \$2,000 and \$2,500. These men can go into practice or take salaried positions that pay on an average more than the salaries paid the bureau inspectors. This fact is being recognized, and competent men, men that the Government ought to have in the service, look at this, and they say, "There is \$1,400 and no chance of any advancement, and consequently we do not care to go into the service." And I think, if you examine the list of graduates of the State veterinary schools, you will find that about the time this bill went into effect a considerable percentage of them went into the service because they expected this promotion in four years to \$1,800. Now, you will find that in the last three or four years very few have gone into the service, and the bureau is having difficulty in getting men. They are giving special examinations continually to secure men, and they are getting men who are making a failure in practice, who are rather failures in other business, and they are taking

this examination to get into the Government service. The good men, the bright men that this Government needs to have in this service are looking elsewhere. In other words, the position of veterinarian does not attract the good men to it as it did a few years ago, and I think the fact that they got them then was because of the supposition, if not guaranty to the men, that they would be promoted to the higher places. I do not think that the compensation paid to the veterinarian inspector and meat inspector, when they have been in the service 2 or 4 or 10 years, is at all comparable with the average income of other men of their training outside. I think that is the substance of the whole proposition.

In urging the passage of the bill amended, as indicated above, I wish to emphasize as strongly as possible the necessity for providing for the now large number of men who are engaged in the service who are doing efficient work and whose salaries have not been advanced as they expected they would be at the time of entering the service.

The importance of an efficient veterinary and meat inspection in this country is shown from the fact that our export trade in meat and its products depends upon the thoroughness of the inspection, for it must be acceptable to the purchasers of our meat products. Further, and of still greater importance, is the fact that the health of our people is in a measure dependent upon the safety for human consumption of the meat sold in our open markets. It was a bitter attack upon our Federal meat inspection by the English medical journal, the *Lancet*, that pointed out the unwholesomeness of our meat products and the inefficiency of the meat inspection of that time, which brought about the law under which the inspection is now being made. This law has for its purpose the maintenance of a sanitary inspection that will safeguard the people against diseased and spoiled meat and establish confidence in our meat and meat products. To this end it provides very properly that the inspection of carcasses shall be made by competent veterinarians and that the meats shall be re-inspected before shipment. To secure men competent to pass upon the complicated conditions that arise in connection with the various diseases that are actually dangerous to man or which render the meat unwholesome, it is necessary to have men properly trained in the nature of the diseases of animals. It is also necessary in order to secure such men to have their compensation commensurate with the service they render.

Through the persistent efforts of the Bureau of Animal Industry there is in the veterinary and meat inspection service an excellent class of men. Many of them are discouraged and they are gradually leaving the service because of the meager compensation they receive. It is necessary for the reputation of our meat and meat products that these inspectors shall be high-class men and thoroughly qualified for the work. The Government demands a high-class service, which it is obtaining. But if it is to continue, it must pay its men what their services are worth. Again, if the Government is to maintain this high standard, provision must be made for the inspectors that will attract good men to this work.

In addition to the necessity of the Government's employing efficient men, I desire to call your attention to certain objectionable conditions connected especially with the veterinary inspection that are certainly not attractive to the ordinary individual.

The veterinary inspectors are constantly handling organs of animals that are infected with diseases communicable to man, such as tuberculosis, anthrax, actinomyeosis, and blood poisoning. During the last few years five men are reported to have been infected with tuberculosis in this work in the city of Buffalo alone. Cases of anthrax are reported. One case of actinomyeosis and numerous cases of blood poisoning have occurred. A few have died and others have become permanently crippled from the loss of one or more fingers. In addition to this, the men are obliged to work in a damp atmosphere and on wet floors, where many of them have contracted rheumatism.

In the quarantine service the inspectors are exposed to the dangers of restraining animals that are wild and frequently they are obliged to live in temporary camps that are illy provided for the severe climatic conditions.

In comparing the salaries of the inspectors in the bureau service with those of municipal inspectors, we find that the Government men are the poorest paid. To illustrate this, the city inspector of Buffalo receives a salary of \$2,000 to start with and \$100 per year increase for three years until a maximum salary of \$2,300 is reached. In Albany a bureau inspector left the service to go into city work. This is true of other positions. Drs. Hadley, Ryder, Rushworth, Smith, Lewis, MacNeal, and other men, whom the Government could not afford to lose, have left the service to take more remunerative positions elsewhere. In most of these cases the men have more than doubled their income. I refer to these simply to show that the salaries of veterinary inspectors are not in proportion to those paid to men of the same training and preparation in other lines of veterinary work.

It is a regrettable fact that during the last few years the Government has lost some of its very best and most substantial inspectors because they have not been promoted as they had expected they would be when they entered the service. Packers are looking for good men among the inspectors whom they can rely upon. If the Government is to retain the services of men who will place the inspection work above reproach, it is necessary to pay them sufficiently.

A just grievance of the meat inspectors is that many of them enter the service in cities where there are veterinary colleges, in which they could receive instruction at night and where they could be eventually graduated and qualify as veterinary inspectors. The Government has forbidden them doing this, although many clerks in other departments in the Government service are permitted to attend night schools.

In order to maintain the efficiency of our Government meat inspection, it is necessary that the salaries and the conditions of work, especially for the professional men, approach somewhat in attractiveness the opportunities for veterinarians in practice and other salaried positions.

It is very important that the committee should understand that the work of the veterinary inspectors and others is very trying; that they have long hours; that their work is beset with many dangers to life and health; that they are men who have spent considerable sums of money and at least three years of time qualifying themselves to do

the work; and that, as a rule, they are not allowed permanency of residence and that the most exacting service is demanded of them. It is an honor to the Bureau of Animal Industry and a credit to the Government that we have developed an efficient meat-inspection service. It is now hoped that Congress will see its way clear by means of this special bill to do justice to those who are devoting themselves to this arduous work by making their salaries commensurate with the services they are rendering.

Mr. LOBECK. Dr. Ravenel, of the University of Wisconsin, will be our next speaker. Dr. Ravenel is professor of bacteriology in the University of Wisconsin, Director of the Wisconsin State Laboratory of Hygiene; member of International Committee on Tuberculosis; member National Committee on Milk Standards, and ex-president United States Live Stock Sanitary Association, Madison, Wis.

STATEMENT OF DR. M. P. RAVENEL, PROFESSOR OF BACTERIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, DIRECTOR OF WISCONSIN STATE LABORATORY OF HYGIENE, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

Dr. RAVENEL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I understand from remarks that the chairman has made, and which have been unanimously concurred in by the members of the committee present, that no argument is needed to show the necessity of this meat inspection and its importance to the country. Therefore the proposition following immediately on that is that if this is acknowledged, then we must agree that any increase in the efficiency of the service is also equally important, and I will confine myself entirely to that.

Now, I am interested in this bill purely from the public-health standpoint. It has been my duty twice, once in 1907 and again last fall, to inspect the service in various parts of the country from a critical standpoint, to criticize it. I have devoted, therefore, on these two occasions, as well as other times, a great deal of attention to the critical study of the service and the men engaged in it.

Acknowledging the importance of the meat inspection generally, then any increase in the efficiency of that inspection must of necessity follow as a good thing. Now, there is one point that has not been mentioned here, the efficiency of the veterinarian is greater—not only are they required to have a higher preliminary education, but they are required to have a better technical education, and in addition to that, they are now required, according to the regulations, to be able to pass on the sanitation of these plants. They are required, in other words, to be sanitary inspectors, to look after the water closets, toilet rooms, spitting on the floors, ventilation, absence of flies—everything that pertains to sanitation, in addition to their veterinary knowledge.

Now, Dr. Moore has pointed out that this service does not attract capable men at the present day as it did in the past. Take our Public Health Service, the Navy service, the Army service, men will go into those services at less salary than they can get outside—and the same is true of professors in universities—they will go into this service for less salary than they can get outside, partly on account of the permanency, partly on account of the certainty of promotion, and partly on account of the delightful dignity which those services carry with

them. Of course, it is said that it is "otium cum dignitate," which is not strictly true. These men in the meat-inspection department do not have that delightful dignity. They work under disagreeable conditions. Many of them go to work at 4 o'clock in the morning and do yard inspection and then do house inspection, and then work until 6 o'clock in the evening, and that on a salary of \$900 to \$1,800 a year.

The dangers of the work have been referred to. Tuberculosis is perhaps the greatest danger; next to that the various blood poisons; next to that anthrax; and then various minor affections like ring worm, inflammations of the skin due to the disinfectants which they are required to use now for their knives and implements, minor disorders of that sort which are not dangerous to life. There is danger from glanders, which is always dangerous to life; tuberculosis is frequently dangerous to life—always dangerous, but frequently fatal. These men are subject to all these things. Now, let me say here that I believe in the merit clause. I do not understand this bill to say that they shall be promoted whether they are good or bad, but with the idea that if their service is satisfactory they have a certainty of promotion you can get better men into the service, if they have permanency and promotion before them, which at present they have not. They are underpaid and overworked.

In regard to the question of this \$100,000 which has been mentioned, Dr. Melvin told me yesterday afternoon, when I had a long conference with him, that \$90,000 of that amount has already been appropriated for this foreign inspection, of duty-free meat, and that leaves only \$10,000 for the betterment of the service. Now I can not reconcile the discrepancies which the chairman has read from this report with the other statement. That statement was made to me only yesterday afternoon, and I presume that contingencies have arisen which have called for a revision. That will have to be looked into; I am not able to explain.

Therefore, the only point I want to make is, that this service being of such great importance any betterment in it is equally important to this country, and I trust sincerely that some such bill as this will be passed putting these men on a permanent basis and giving them an expectation for the future of their life, which will attract better men to the service all the time. Of course it is a fact that the requirements of every veterinary school are constantly being raised year by year.

Mr. SLOAN. Doctor, how do you figure it would be better and more attractive to these men who are going into the service to have an annual salary increase given to them under the law, than to leave that to the large and wise discretion of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Animal Industry, which I think is in charge of this matter. I would just like to have your idea on that.

Dr. RAVENEL. The only answer I can give to that is the one made already, that the only answer that has ever been made by the bureau is that they have not the money for this purpose.

Mr. SLOAN. Assuming that an increased appropriation might be made and given to the Bureau of Animal Industry to increase these salaries, should it be compelled to make the increases under this iron-clad rule suggested here, at the end of the year, or should it be left to the discretion of the department? You see the difference, do you not,

between the present plan, which leaves it largely with the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Animal Industry, and putting it in a statute which says that at the end of each year automatically there shall be an increase? Now, what I would like to hear is a discussion of that from the standpoint of the man entering the service and staying in the service—why it would be so much more important for him to have the statute this way than to leave it in the hands of the bureau.

Dr. RAVENEL. Because it would take it out of the hands of one person. It would eliminate favoritism entirely. The man would know that if he had attended to his duties properly he was certain of an increase.

Mr. HAWLEY. That has been suggested a good many times, the question of favoritism, and I intended to ask, as a matter of fact, are such things occurring?

Dr. RAVENEL. Not to my knowledge, sir. But take the Army, the Public-Health Service, and almost every educational institution in the country, you have an automatic raise if your services are satisfactory at the end of certain periods of time. The University of Wisconsin, for example, every three years gives an increase in salary until the maximum is reached.

Mr. SLOAN. Is that not done by the board of trustees and not by a statute of the State of Wisconsin?

Dr. RAVENEL. That is true, but the board of regents have passed it and it practically has the value of a statute. It is something which the man entering the service knows he is going to get. It can not be compulsory, but he knows he is going to get it.

Mr. MAGUIRE. After all, is it the fact that nearly all cases of promotions in universities are based upon efficiency—is that not the final test?

Dr. RAVENEL. Yes and no—I should say that was the final test. But there are many cases, for example, where a man is neither good enough to praise nor bad enough to damn—that is the hardest class always to deal with in life—where he knows he will get his promotion unless he is signally inefficient. But I am not asking to bring that sort of men into the service—they are not the sort of men that we want to see in the service.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you take your seat, Doctor, as to how this \$100,000 that the committee allowed is to be used, I wish to quote at length from the record the statement of Dr. Melvin [reading]:

Mr. HAWLEY. Do you have any actual demand now that would require the expenditure of any considerable part of the \$100,000 additional?

Dr. MELVIN. We are up to date on all applications for inspection, and there are none now being withheld; but, as I was going to explain, to take care of any additional demands for inspection, and also to provide for increases in salaries for some of our deserving employees, this \$200,000 under the present appropriation has been used in increasing the force of some stations where they did not have sufficient force and in providing promotions for some of our employees.

Mr. HAWLEY. There has been reported in the consular reports that big plants are being constructed in Australia and other parts of that section of the world for the shipment of frozen carcasses of cattle, sheep, and possibly hogs to the United States. Do you expect to use any part of this in the inspection of those carcasses? Several shipments, I believe, have already been received in San Francisco.

Dr. MELVIN. No, sir; we expect to ask for a separate fund for the inspection of imported meats. We have been taking care of that so far out of this \$3,200,000, but I think it is going to increase to such an extent that it will be necessary to ask for a separate appropriation to provide for that work. C

Mr. HAWLEY. Have you estimated for that?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I may say that when these estimates were prepared (they were submitted on the 15th of October) we had not had an opportunity to determine fully just what additional expense the inspection of imported meats would entail. The tariff law has now been in effect long enough to enable Dr. Melvin to make an approximate estimate of the cost of inspecting imported meats. On the basis of this estimate it will require for the next year about \$45,000 over and above what is included in the regular estimates. If the committee desires, we will submit that estimate in the form of a memorandum to go in the record.

Dr. MELVIN. Of course, in addition to that, we are now financing out of our present funds the work necessary in the inspection of imported live animals. We have not made any additional estimate for that, but I think probably I can take care of that out of the present estimates.

That is from page 62 of the hearings before this committee on the agricultural appropriation bill. That is the direct statement of Dr. Melvin and Dr. Galloway before this committee that this \$100,000 is not to be used for the purpose of inspecting imported meats. It is to be used in large measure in providing increases in the salaries of these employees.

Mr. HELGESEN. Before Dr. Ravenel leaves—he says that he has made an inspection of these plants. Having done so, and undoubtedly he is competent to judge, I would like to have him give us his opinion as to the character of inspection he found on his examination.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that will be very interesting to the committee if you can give us that very briefly, Doctor.

Dr. RAVENEL. The efficiency of the service, in my opinion, is above question. One thing I would demand is the extension of inspection. It is in my opinion a pity——

Mr. HAWLEY (interposing). What do you mean by the extension of the inspection service?

Dr. RAVENEL. Of the service. Only about 60 per cent of the meats eaten by the American public are given a Government inspection. I came across a most striking example of that in San Francisco. It was reported to me that the biggest cattlemen in the country have had two houses, one under Government inspection and one not—two slaughterhouses. Their best cattle went to the house under inspection, and yet during some months tuberculosis would run 26 per cent of the animals in that one house. Their worst meats went to the uninspected house, and what would you suppose it would be in this uninspected house when it ran 26 per cent in the best house?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, we would have no jurisdiction over that meat used within the State.

Mr. HAUGEN. You say that only 60 per cent of the meat in this country is being inspected by the United States Government?

Dr. RAVENEL. Yes; not over that. I have heard it put at 58.9 per cent, but 60 per cent is a liberal estimate.

Mr. HAWLEY. Is 60 per cent of the meat, then, used in interstate commerce?

Dr. RAVENEL. I believe interstate meat is all taken care of, but all intrastate meat is not subject to inspection by the United States.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Of that 26 per cent there, all of that was hogs and cattle, was it?

Dr. RAVENEL. Mostly cattle. Hogs in Wisconsin will run as high as 20 per cent tuberculous, and sometimes over 30 per cent. I have found in my inspection that at the present time hogs run as high as 20 per cent.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Of cholera, you mean?

Dr. RAVENEL. No, sir; tuberculosis.

Mr. MAGUIRE. How many of these infected cattle and hogs are detected in the yards—these tubercular animals—before they reach the slaughter table?

Dr. RAVENEL. None at all, sir.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Is not the veterinary inspector able to detect symptoms of tuberculosis or other diseases in animals?

Dr. RAVENEL. No, sir; not tuberculosis. There is no way of detecting tuberculosis in hogs on the hoof that I know of, except where tuberculosis is very far advanced. You understand that the life of the hog is so short that tuberculosis does not often become far enough advanced to be detected on the hoof.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I have been advised by inspectors and I have gone through slaughterhouses a good deal for the purpose of examining their methods, but I have understood that there was a large number of men outside in the yards for the purpose of inspecting apparently diseased animals.

Dr. RAVENEL. There are yard inspectors, but I think they catch very few cases of tuberculosis in hogs, practically none. They catch hog cholera and scabies in sheep, but I think the yard inspection is of more value to the live stock industry than it is to human life. The yard man can detect actinomycosis, or "lumpy jaw" in cattle, advanced pregnancy, and recent calving, and things of that sort, but in Chicago last fall there were three yard inspectors, three men on the scales and nine sets of scales in that yard, and you can see that three men could not do much with 90,000 animals coming in there in a day.

Mr. HAWLEY. What animals that are used for human food are affected with glanders?

Dr. RAVENEL. None at all.

Mr. HAWLEY. You mentioned that disease.

Dr. RAVENEL. Interstate shipments and export shipments of horses—the inspectors are required to inspect them. But, generally speaking, there is no food animal that has glanders. Of course, you know that horse meat is used for free lunch counter sausage a great deal. But the United States Bureau of Animal Industry does not inspect horses. (34 Stat., 674, provides only for inspection of cattle, sheep, swine, and goats.) The inspectors are also exposed to the germs of glanders in the bureau laboratories.

Mr. REILLY. Does your statement that only 60 per cent of the meat is being inspected have any reference at all to State inspection?

Dr. RAVENEL. Does it refer to State inspections? I do not know just what your question means.

Mr. REILLY. Is there not a State inspection also?

Dr. RAVENEL. Certain States have inspection laws, but they are few, and they have no complete inspection worthy of the name. I do not know of any State that has an inspection worthy of the name.

Mr. MOSS. I should like to make a statement there for the record, as far as Indiana is concerned; we have a State inspection there as severe as the Government inspection, and even before an animal can be shipped into Indiana from the outside, from any other State, they must notify the State inspector and he comes and gives the tuberculin test and other tests as to health.

Dr. RAVENEL. You are quite right, so far as that is concerned. Many States have an interstate examination of animals, but in what State is there an examination of all private slaughterhouses?

Mr. MOSS. In Indiana.

Dr. RAVENEL. Do you have that all over the State of Indiana?

Mr. MOSS. Absolutely; yes. There is not a slaughterhouse in Indiana that is not inspected.

Dr. RAVENEL. I am glad to hear that. Indiana has the best health laws of any State in the Union, so far as I know, but I did not know that they had general inspection of private slaughterhouses.

Mr. McDERMOTT. What percentage of tuberculosis have you found in the dairy herds?

Dr. RAVENEL. That varies greatly. In some of our experiment stations the herds run as high as 98 per cent. We estimate that in Wisconsin about 5 per cent of the dairy cattle are affected. I do not think that is correct, but that is as close as we can get at it.

The importation of meats from foreign countries is much larger now than it was at the time these hearings were had, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. I really could not say, because I have not looked it up; but I think that is true.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have looked the matter up, and it is much larger than I had anticipated, and that may account to some extent for the variation in the estimates of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be.

Mr. LOBECK. Congressman Claude Weaver, of Oklahoma, wishes to be heard for a few minutes, to be called when he has spoken for 10 minutes.

STATEMENT OF HON. CLAUDE WEAVER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the committee for its courtesy in permitting me to make a short statement. I realize that the members of this committee are much better informed on questions of agriculture than a member of the Banking and Currency Committee like myself would be, and especially since quite a number of the members have been practical farmers from their youth upward. Congressional government is largely government by committees.

The great Committee on Agriculture of this House is charged with a responsibility, the importance of which can not be overestimated. I do not assume the rôle of expert, and, disclaiming superior knowledge, I desire in a plain, blunt way to present the cause of the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, sincerely believing in the justice of that cause. Those employees for whom I speak deal, on behalf of the Government, directly with live stock—with the live-stock industry that furnishes a great part of the food that sustains the life of our people.

Gentlemen, the live-stock industry in the United States is one of supreme importance as well as of tremendous magnitude. This country produces one-twelfth of the world's sheep, one-eighth of the world's cattle, and one-third of the world's hogs. During the six years from 1907 to 1912 the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture, according to the official report of Dr. A. D. Melvin, chief of that bureau, has inspected in round numbers 321,000,000 animals. Of this number nearly 1,000,000 carcasses

were rejected. In the reinspection of meat and meat-food products in their various preparations 37,000,000,000 pounds of animal food products were examined by skilled and competent employees of the bureau and 140,000,000 pounds rejected. Seven billion pounds of meats in that period of time have been exported under certificates. Packeries in 238 cities and towns in the United States are now under Government supervision and their products under Government inspection, and 2,400 veterinary inspectors and assistants are employed in this work. The appropriation of \$3,000,000 has been inadequate to meet the ever-growing expenses of this field.

Let me call the attention of the committee to what the meat-inspection department of the Bureau of Animal Industry has done in a single year.

I will ask the privilege, since it is conceded that this matter is one of very great importance—this matter of meat inspection—in fact, Mr. Helgesen stated a great economic truth when he said it was the most important of any department of the Government, because it affects not only human health but human life; this having been conceded, I will ask the privilege of placing in the record a statement of Dr. A. D. Melvin, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, dated June 30, 1913, showing the magnitude of the work in the last year.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that permission will be granted. (The statement referred to is as follows:)

THE MEAT INSPECTION DIVISION.

The Federal meat inspection is assigned to the Meat Inspection Division, of which Dr. R. P. Steddom is chief. The work of the year shows a slight decrease from that of the preceding year, doubtless due to the general decline in the number of meat-producing animals in the country.

THE FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION.

Inspection was conducted during the year at 910 establishments in 251 cities and towns, as compared with 940 establishments in 259 cities and towns during the fiscal year 1912. Inspection was begun at 63 establishments and withdrawn from 115 establishments during the year. The causes of withdrawal were as follows: Discontinuance of slaughtering or of interstate business, 80 establishments; by request, 17; failure to comply with the provisions of the law and regulations, 17; because of exemption under the law, 1.

There is a decrease in the number of all species of animals slaughtered except sheep, which show an increase of over half a million. The decrease in the number of hogs slaughtered is nearly 2,700,000 and in cattle over 375,000. It is noteworthy that with a decrease of nearly 2,700,000 in the total number of animals slaughtered the number of carcasses condemned is nearly 47,000 greater in 1913 than in 1912. The increase in condemnations is greatest in hogs and is due principally to hog cholera. Tuberculosis continues to be the greatest cause of condemnations.

Statistics of the meat inspection for the year are given in the tables which follow.

Ante-mortem inspections of animals, fiscal year 1913.

Kind of animals.	Passed.	Suspected. ¹	Total inspected.
Cattle.....	7,125,467	44,585	7,170,052
Calves.....	2,090,412	3,089	2,093,501
Swine.....	32,277,682	94,593	32,372,275
Sheep.....	14,725,856	5,059	14,730,915
Goats.....	56,562	7	56,569
Total.....	56,275,979	147,333	56,423,312

¹ This term is used to designate animals found or suspected of being unfit for food on ante-mortem inspection, most of which are afterwards slaughtered under special supervision, the final disposition being determined on post-mortem inspection.

Post-mortem inspections, fiscal year 1913.

Kind of animals.	Passed for food.	Passed for lard and tallow only.	Condemned.	Total.
Cattle.....	7,099,080	5,961	50,775	7,155,816
Calves.....	2,089,217	51	9,216	2,098,484
Swine.....	31,968,407	145,194	173,937	32,287,538
Sheep.....	14,705,853	1,955	16,657	14,724,465
Goats.....	56,478	2	76	56,556
Total.....	55,919,035	153,163	250,661	56,322,859

Diseases and conditions for which condemnations were made on post-mortem inspection, fiscal year 1913.

Causes of condemnation.	Cattle.		Calves.		Swine.		Sheep.		Goats.	
	Car-casses.	Parts.	Car-casses.	Parts.	Car-casses.	Parts.	Car-casses.	Parts.	Car-casses.	Parts.
Tuberculosis.....	33,001	47,554	450	410	47,630	359,047	1			
Actinomycosis.....	380	70,840	3	589						
Caseous lymphadenitis.....							2,340		14	
Hog cholera.....					88,547					
Tumors and abscesses.....	232	3,789	20	185	1,715	3,830	106	55	1	1
Septicemia, pyemia, and uremia.....	1,501		266		10,228		876		7	
Pregnancy and recent parturition.....	371				40		104			
Immaturity.....			3,848							
Pneumonia, pleurisy, enteritis, hepatitis, peritonitis, metritis, etc.....	4,001		920		14,115		3,650		4	
Icterus.....	73		26		3,242		1,881		1	
Texas fever.....	340		529							
Injuries, bruises, etc.....	3,013	824	684	111	1,046	6,911	1,150	185	6	
Sexual odor.....					2,315					
Asphyxiation.....					1,535		42			
Emaciation.....	6,575		2,301		1,256		5,586		40	
Cysticercus.....	697	4,348	45	37	72		555	453	1	
Miscellaneous.....	591	2,784	124	45	2,196	4,205	366	246	2	
Total.....	50,775	130,139	9,216	1,377	173,937	373,993	16,657	939	76	1

In addition to the foregoing, there were tanked the carcasses of animals found dead or in a dying condition, as follows: Cattle, 1,325; calves, 1,197; swine, 45,266; sheep, 5,990; goats, 16; total, 53,794.

The following table, showing meat and meat food products prepared and processed under the supervision of bureau employees, is a statement of work done rather than a report of the actual quantity of product prepared. The same product is sometimes duplicated by being reported in the various stages of preparation under more than one heading.

Meat and meat food products prepared and processed under bureau supervision, fiscal year 1913, in pounds.

Kind of product.	Weight.	Kind of product.	Weight.
Beef placed in cure.....	153,758,668	Lard stearin.....	4,657,484
Pork placed in cure.....	2,545,357,914	Lard compound.....	6,191,785
All other classes placed in cure.....	3,360,295	Lard substitute.....	662,783,844
Sausage chopped.....	531,626,284	Bakers' compound.....	1,826,254
Canned beef.....	87,364,417	Oleo stock and edible tallow.....	49,618,387
Canned pork.....	23,469,386	Oleo oil.....	141,842,652
All other canned meats.....	4,403,486	Oleo stearin.....	73,243,775
Meat extract.....	311,168	Oleomargarine.....	145,356,382
Steam and kettle rendered lard.....	1,114,334,643	Miscellaneous products.....	1,430,592,450
Leaf lard.....	19,851,102		
Neutral lard.....	88,670,975	Total weight.....	7,094,809,809
Lard oil.....	6,188,458		

The quantity of meat and meat food products condemned on reinspection because of having become sour, tainted, putrid, unclean, rancid, or otherwise unwholesome was as follows: Beef, 6,712,049 pounds; pork, 11,936,913 pounds; mutton, 146,061 pounds; veal, 56,429 pounds; goat meat, 478 pounds; total, 18,851,930 pounds.

For the export of meat and meat food products, 90,653 certificates of inspection were issued, covering 133,582,083 pounds of beef, 840,745,518 pounds of pork, and 2,855,335 pounds of mutton, a total of 977,182,936 pounds. This included 219,750,834 pounds specially prepared with preservatives as allowed by foreign Governments.

There were also issued 2,049 certificates for exports of 17,412,924 pounds of inedible animal products.

STATEMENT OF PROVISIONS OF THE LOBECK BILL.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, in urging the committee to make a favorable report on the Lobeck bill I desire to give some of the reasons why, as a Member of Congress, I shall support it myself, believing that these reasons may influence the committee in the same way that they have influenced my mind and judgment, resulting in the fixed conclusion that the bill is founded in the principles of equity and justice as well as in sound public policy for the maintenance and the upbuilding of this great department of the public service.

This bill, H. R. 9292, introduced by Congressman Charles Lobeck on November 14, 1913, which has already been presented by him with singular clearness and force of logic, supported by a cogent statement of the facts, is simple indeed in its terms. The bill provides for the classification, by statute fixed and permanent, of the salaries of (1) veterinary inspectors, (2) meat inspectors, (3) inspectors' assistants, (4) stock examiners, (5) skilled laborers, and (6) clerks employed in the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, outside of the executive offices in the city of Washington, and within the classified service. Each class is to receive, automatically, at the end of each year's faithful and efficient service, an annual increase of \$100 until a maximum is reached. The entrance salary of veterinary inspectors is \$1,400 and the maximum \$2,400. The entrance salary of meat inspectors is \$1,000 and the maximum \$1,600. The entrance salary of assistant inspectors is \$840 and the maximum \$1,600. The entrance salary of stock examiners is not fixed by the bill and the maximum is \$1,600. The entrance salary of skilled laborers is not fixed by the bill and the maximum is \$1,200. I suggest that the bill should be amended to fix the entrance salary of both these classes. The entrance salary of the clerks outside of the executive offices in the city of Washington, D. C., within the classified service and actually employed as such in the Bureau of Animal Industry, is fixed at \$900 and the maximum at \$1,500.

The fundamental principle of the bill is apparent, and that is to reward faithful, efficient, and continuous service. Fidelity should be rewarded, and continuous service increases the skill of the employees and is the parent of efficiency.

So that under this graduated scale the employee has an incentive to fidelity, to endeavor, and to the concentration of all his powers on his work, and Carlyle has well said that work is alone noble.

Now, I do not claim, gentlemen of the committee, that these boys engaged in this work are better than Government employees engaged in other lines, or that they are entitled to greater consideration, but I do claim that they are entitled to as much consideration as any employees of any class, high or low, in all the range of the service of

this great Government. I know many of these employees personally, and I know them well. They are able, skilled, and competent, because they obtained their positions by the test of rigid civil-service examination, from which political influences were altogether eliminated. They are sober, because the Government will not keep drunken men in its service, and because the civil-service rules deny examination to those addicted to intoxicants. They are law-abiding. They are moral. They take high rank for intelligence and good citizenship.

Moreover, they are engaged in a work of peculiar hazard and of peculiar hardship. Their work takes them over floors shoe-mouth deep in blood. They go from rooms that are steaming hot into rooms of Arctic cold. They handle meat infected with tuberculosis bacilli and other infectious germs. They are liable from exposure to such germs to contract typhoid fever, consumption, and other diseases. They are called to work at hours before dawn, when other Government employees are sleeping in their beds. They are liable to accidents from machinery, and some have been crippled and maimed. They are subject to blood poison from accidental wounds from knives used in inspection. For these reasons they ought to have more pay.

Now, what I want to call to the special attention of you gentlemen is the viewpoint of these men engaged in this work, in this service, the veterinary surgeons and inspectors and others engaged in the work of inspection. Of course, as a legal proposition, and technically speaking, they are not employed by Congress. They have no right of redress; they can not go into court; they have not even a legal status.

On the 30th of June, 1906, Congress passed a law as a part of the Agricultural bill creating this bureau, providing for this meat inspection, and appropriated \$3,000,000 for it, and gave to the Department of Agriculture the right of expending that money and the right to carry out the design of Congress in this inspection, and following incidentally as the result, the right to employ all of the different men engaged in the work. Now, these men went into that work with a promise from the Department of Agriculture. They were under the civil service and had to stand an examination. Some were veterinarians, and of course had to be graduates, after studying three years in high-grade recognized schools. The Civil Service Commission and the Department of Agriculture announced to all who proposed to enter into this newly-created branch of the service as veterinary inspectors with the entrance salary of \$1,400, that promotion to \$1,600 would be made after two years' satisfactory service, with promotion to \$1,800 after satisfactory service for two years at \$1,600 per annum. The above schedule was announced by the United States Civil Service Commission in the following publications:

First. A telegram posted at the McKillip Veterinary College at Chicago, Ill., March 27, 1907.

Second. Notice No. 805 of examination of April 17, 1907.

Third. Civil Service Manual of Examinations, revised to July 1, 1907, section 217, page 66.

Fourth. Notice No. 133 of examination of July 24, 1907.

Fifth. Civil Service Manual revised to January 1, 1908, section 233, page 69.

Sixth. Notice No. 126 for examination of February 26, 1908.

Seventh. Civil Service Manual, revised to July 1, 1908, section 238, pages 69-70.

Eighth. Civil Service Manual, revised to January 1, 1909, section 248, page 72.

Ninth. Notice No. 34, for examination, January 20, 1909.

So that in every authorized publication of the department of this Government that alone had authority to employ these men the specific promise was made to them that by faithful and efficient service for a certain length of time automatically they would get an increase in pay. Now that is a fundamental proposition, and the crux of the thing is that they have not received it.

SALARY SCHEDULE ANNOUNCED FOR INSPECTORS' ASSISTANTS.

The first announcement for the schedule for inspector's assistants was contained in the notice for examination issued by the Civil Service Commission to be held on September 5, 1907 (Notice Form No. 1248), and the statement regarding the schedule of salaries read as follows:

The United States Civil Service Commission announces an examination on September 5, 1907, at the places mentioned in the list printed hereon, to secure eligibles from which to make certifications to fill vacancies as they may occur in the position of inspector's assistant (male) at \$840 per annum, in the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture. Promotion to \$1,000 per annum is made after three years' satisfactory service at \$840; promotion to \$1,200 is made after three years' satisfactory service at \$1,000 and after passing an examination for promotion.

All the notices of examinations for this position issued by the Civil Service Commission from September 5, 1907, up to and including the notice dated January 13, 1909, included the same announcement regarding salary schedule. Those schedules were also published in the United States Civil Service Manual as follows:

Issue revised to January 1, 1908, section 143, page 52.

Issue revised to July 1, 1908, section 144, page 51.

Issue revised to January 1, 1909, section 150, page 53.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Do you contend that a promise of the Civil Service Commission is binding, either legally or morally, upon Congress?

Mr. WEAVER. No, sir; I am talking about a case of equity. I am talking about employees who went in through these promises from the only authority of the Government that had authority to employ them and did employ them. Of course, if you base it on a purely legal proposition they have no case. I believe with Grotius, who said that, "Equity is the correction of that wherein the law, by reason of its universality, is deficient."

Mr. HAWLEY. That is Blackstone isn't it?

Mr. WEAVER. No; I am quoting from Grotius now, and Blackstone quoted the definition from him and you read it in Blackstone.

Mr. HAUGEN. Can you state to what extent this contract has been repudiated?

Mr. WEAVER. Yes, sir; I can give you the result of it.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Are you quoting from the notices when you read there?

Mr. WEAVER. Yes. Now let me read you what the Bureau of Animal Industry says on that proposition. We will see what Dr. Melvin, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, said in his report of November 19, 1912 [reading]:

The number of employees in the service of the bureau at the beginning of the fiscal year (July 1, 1911) was 3,284. During the year there were 638 resignations and terminations, including 28 dismissals for cause. The accessions by appointment, reinstatement, and transfer numbered 665. The force on July 1, 1912, numbered 3,311, of whom 2,410 were engaged in the work of meat inspection.

Owing to the rapid increase of the work of the bureau, the funds from which promotions are ordinarily made are consumed in providing for this extension of the work. It is only natural that employees entering the service under the impression that they are to receive promotion after satisfactory service should become dissatisfied and disgruntled at not being advanced in salary after a reasonable time.

. Did they become dissatisfied?

Did they? I will put in the record a list showing where more than 300 thoroughly efficient, competent men in the employ of this department, engaged in work essential to the good of the public service, have resigned because of the fact that either they had failed to receive what they were pledged to receive, or that there was something more inviting in another field of work.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you carried that proposition further and made any inquiry to find what percentage of postal employees, for instance, have resigned?

Mr. WEAVER. No, sir; but I will discuss that question later if I have time.

Mr. HAUGEN. What is the number of employees who were deprived of this advance which you claim was promised to them?

Mr. WEAVER. I can put that in the record if we have the figures at hand.

Now, I was diverted from my point. Let me finish what this credible, disinterested witness, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Dr. A. D. Melvin, says:

In order to attract and hold capable men, as well as to reward efficient service, I consider it desirable that some definite schedule of promotions should be arranged for the different classes of employees, and that funds should be provided by Congress according to these schedules so that those who are giving their best efforts to the service may expect and realize promotions within a reasonable time.

Now, a great many of these men have failed to get what they were under the impression they would get, and through no fault of theirs, but for the reason that the Secretary of Agriculture has not had the money in his hands or at his disposal. He wanted these men to get the money. They ought to get the money. They ought to get what they are asking for, and this bill is simply a standardization; simply a proposition of classification whereby the man will know when he goes into the service what he is to expect.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not realize this fact—if you will permit me—that the Secretary of Agriculture, in making his estimates to this committee and Congress, usually asks for such money as he wants, and is it not fair to this committee to say that this committee usually gives him just as much as he asks for, and in this particular instance did they not do that?

Mr. WEAVER. I think I can answer that question by an illustration—the story of the fellow who told the sheriff that they could not put him in jail for a certain charge, but he was in jail, just the same, when he made his observation. These men were promised the money and they never have gotten it, and that is the reason they are here now asking simply that when they go into the employment of the Government they may know in advance what they may expect.

Other employees of the Government know that when they have served a certain length of time they will receive a certain promotion.

Mr. HAUGEN. In this report here the department has been charged with repudiation, and it is up to the man that makes the charge to prove his allegation.

Mr. WEAVER. Now, you probably have not understood me. I have not charged willful repudiation.

Mr. HAUGEN. Well, that charge has been made before this committee several times, and it is up to you people to prove that the department has repudiated its contract. That is fair to the department.

Mr. WEAVER. I would not have made that interpolation about equity if I had claimed that. The Department of Agriculture wants these men to have their money, and I think Congress, when it knows all the facts, will want them to have their money. The department has so many demands it diverted the money these boys should have received.

The CHAIRMAN. If that is true, Mr. Weaver, has not the department used, as the department says it has used, the \$200,000 that we gave them in the current year, and are they not going to use the \$100,000 that we gave in the bill for the next fiscal year as they told us they were going to use it?

Mr. WEAVER. I am not familiar with the workings of the department. I heard the last speaker make the statement that \$90,000 out of the \$100,000 within the discretion of the Department of Agriculture had been appropriated to other useful purposes, but not to carry out the contract or inducement to these men.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you heard me read the testimony of Dr. Melvin on the subject.

Mr. WEAVER. I understood that it was after Dr. Melvin made that statement that these expenses came up and this \$90,000 was diverted.

Mr. HAUGEN. I can not believe that the department is guilty of repudiation.

Mr. WEAVER. I do not either. Let me finish my statement. I do not charge that. This is a condition, not a theory, and that is what we are trying to remedy. Here is a provision to carry out this great efficient humanitarian work for the public health, for the preservation of the lives of the people by providing for proper inspection——

Mr. REILLY. This committee has to depend upon the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture in making appropriations. Now, why should we make a special exception for this special Bureau of Animal Industry?

Mr. WEAVER. I can answer that in a minute. Congress, as a rule, makes blanket appropriations, to be expended by the various departments according to the rules and regulations of the department. We do not make specific appropriations.

Mr. REILLY. Who is better capable of determining what the salary should be and when they should be increased than the chief of the department?

Mr. WEAVER. They are supposed to keep promises when they make them. A man is supposed to get what has been promised him.

Mr. REILLY. There is absolutely no record of any promise ever having been made by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WEAVER. Well, there are the identical records on that question. I have put the promises in the record.

Mr. HAUGEN. There is a record of a promise, but no record of repudiation.

Mr. WEAVER. Well, the men haven't got the money. You can not get away from that. If I show the promise, prove the promise, and that it was not kept, is that repudiation or not? I claim that the defect is in the law; that these men ought to know beforehand what they are going to get and when they are going to get it.

Now, if Congress will appropriate this money for certain expenditures, then it will not be a question of discretion as to how that money will be expended, and the Secretary of Agriculture will not ignore the just demands of these men in order to increase the service in some other branch.

The men in the Postal Service, the mail clerks and rural carriers, the employees in the Reclamation Service, in the Bureau of Public Health, the soldiers of the Army, the officers in the Army, the marines in the Navy, the blue jacket and the admiral, all have a steadily advancing scale which is based on length of service and efficiency. Now, just a word on the question of efficiency. Any man who is not efficient ought not to stay in the service an hour, and when a man remains in the service for years, the presumption is that he is efficient.

Mr. HELGESEN. There were 28 dismissals for cause. That shows that they have the right to dismiss them, and that they do dismiss them sometimes.

Mr. WEAVER. I ask that the names of more than 300 men who have resigned be put in the record. I have the list here. When a man resigns that is not a dismissal. The efficient resign, the inefficient are dismissed.

Mr. MAGUIRE. For what year is that?

Mr. WEAVER. It is not for just a year. It is all the resignations since October, 1912, and there are over 300 of them.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Is that for a period of one year?

Mr. WEAVER. It is for little more than a year. This is from the Department of Agriculture, a list of scientific and technical employees who have resigned from the Bureau of Animal Industry since October, 1912.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this a list of men engaged in this work?

Mr. WEAVER. Yes; they are all classified. This is an official list from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PATTON. Two hundred and some odd have resigned in a year.

Mr. WEAVER. Yes; I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your intention to put the names of these parties in the record?

Mr. WEAVER. I think it will be very useful in the hearings to have the names.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, without objection, it may be done.

(The list referred to is as follows:)

List of scientific and technical employees who have resigned from the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, since October, 1912.

Name.	Position.	Salary per annum.
White, James O.	Inspector's assistant.	\$840
Brown, Arthur C.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Kanstoroom, David S.	do.	1,800
Thurgate, Edward A.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Bennett, Joseph S.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Orme, Frank W.	do.	1,400
Noback, Charles V.	do.	1,400
Rishel, Albert E.	do.	2,250
Pilchard, Mack R.	Stock examiner.	1,000
Hendren, Samuel.	Veterinary inspector.	1,800
Gladish, John J.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Trimble, Virges E.	do.	840
Morris, David T.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Martin, Edward E.	Inspector's assistant.	840
McEachran, William.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Moorman, Ross.	Junior animal husbandman.	1,380
Wing, Charles C.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Hansen, Christian N.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Heaton, Edward B.	Junior dairyman.	1,400
Textor, Roy.	Agent in scabies eradication.	720
Perry, Thomas E.	Agent in tick eradication.	900
Moore, James M.	Agent in animal husbandry.	1,000
Kinzy, Grover.	Collaborator.	300
Suddath, Robert O.	Agent in tick eradication.	840
Skinner, James D.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Grundy, George G.	Veterinary inspector.	1,800
Prather, Eddie M.	do.	1,600
Cranford, Wesley H.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Wheeler, D. N.	Stock examiner.	1,200
Kelting, Henry C.	Meat inspector.	1,200
Flint, Edgar M.	Junior dairyman.	1,440
Sell, Benjamin.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Steffen, Martin R.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Zimmerman, John.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Smith, Walter E.	Inspector's assistant.	840
McGill, James L.	Stock examiner.	1,000
Saunders, William H.	do.	1,200
Eagle, Alexander F.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Huff, Joseph N.	do.	1,400
Newman, John B.	Collaborator.	(1)
Schroebel, R. R.	Agent in scabies eradication.	1,000
Dawson, Wilburn.	Agent in tick eradication.	840
Sweet, Harry D.	Agent in scabies eradication.	720
Ballard, Henry A.	do.	720
Wilkes, Richard W. A.	do.	1,000
English, John H.	do.	720
Knox, Edward W.	do.	840
Herwick, Frank V.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Doherty, Patrick H.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Sims, Frank C.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Thorpe, Ira.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Richards, Albert S.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Moldenhauer, Charles F.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Burke, James W.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Bailey, Alfred L.	do.	1,600
Bankert, Andrew F.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Neill, John.	do.	1,000
Atwood, Elmer R.	Inspector's assistant.	900
Faville, George C.	Veterinary inspector.	1,800
Hogan, Thomas L.	Meat inspector.	1,200
Thompson, John D.	do.	1,200
White, Frederick W.	do.	1,000
Mather, Chalmer A.	Agent in scabies eradication.	1,000
Gray, Daniel T.	Expert in animal husbandry.	300
Moore, G. Emery.	Agent in scabies eradication.	720
Gilbert, Louis C.	do.	1,000
Trees, Oliver P.	Inspector's assistant.	1,000
Paul, William L.	Meat inspector.	1,200
Eagle, Richard F.	Veterinary inspector.	2,000
Smith, Albert S.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Piquette, George L.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Smith, Fred B.	do.	840
Smith, Joseph W.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Gibbs, W. H.	Inspector.	1,800

¹ \$5 per day when actually employed.

List of scientific and technical employees who have resigned from the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, since October, 1912—Continued.

Name.	Position.	Salary per annum.
Larsen, Peter G.	Inspector's assistant.	\$840
Gibson, Fred W.	do.	840
Laird, Ernest E.	do.	900
Thompson, Leroy F.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Jacobus, Fred H.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Seybold, Charles M.	Inspector's assistant.	900
Riley, William H.	do.	840
Sheehan, Thomas S.	do.	840
Smith, Robert E.	Meat inspector.	1,320
Atherton, William T.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Anders, Thomas O.	do.	1,400
Gamrath, Carl L.	do.	1,400
Johnson, Fred E.	do.	1,800
Poe, Thurman E.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Shaw, Robert F.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Rigdon, Scott J.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Winfield, Peter S.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Hurd, Manzo B.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Zimmerman, Charles E.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Dillingham, Willis I.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Goodman, Arthur H.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Lacy, Walter J.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Lichtenwalter, H. C. W.	do.	1,400
Beck, D. S.	Agent in tick eradication.	900
Hervey, Hugh H.	Inspector's assistant.	900
Griffin, Daniel J.	do.	840
Brown, Charles H.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Coffey, John M.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Ryan, Joseph A.	do.	840
Marsh, Hadleigh.	Laboratory assistant.	1,200
Casserly, Timothy.	Meat inspector.	1,200
Metheny, Claud.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Hutchens, Harry C.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Lowe, Clifton D.	do.	1,400
Evans, John G.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Pateman, Ralph W.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Boardman, Miles E.	Agent in scabies eradication.	900
Smith, Cyrus B.	do.	1,000
Ikenberry, Ezra A.	Dairyman.	1,620
O'Banion, Archie L.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Day, Charles M.	do.	1,800
Leaf, Roy.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Ehret, Howard W.	do.	840
Eyre, Will H.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Wilson, Albert H.	do.	1,000
Richardson, Robert R.	do.	1,000
Warden, Ira J.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Bracken, William J.	Veterinary inspector.	1,800
Sparhawk, William T.	do.	1,800
Moore, Hubert O.	do.	1,600
Davis, Frank H.	do.	1,400
McShane, John E.	Meat inspector.	1,000
McGehee, Louis H.	do.	1,000
Morrow, John E.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Miller, John W.	Agent in scabies eradication.	720
Sponsler, Joseph H.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Grimes, Robert B.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Jones, Thomas H.	do.	1,600
Meixel, Earl J.	do.	1,400
Lee, Alfred N.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Irwin, William J.	do.	1,000
Swanson, Charles A.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Pigott, Homer S.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Anglicker, Jacob.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Burcham, Deverda H.	Meat inspector.	1,200
Martin, Homer.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Sullivan, John E.	do.	840
Niehaus, Herman R.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Houk, Sylvanus E.	do.	1,400
Roth, Gustav F.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Steffen, Martin R.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Casserly, Timothy L.	do.	1,400
Skinner, Temple P.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Riley, Edward H.	Animal husbandman.	1,560
Beall, Ambrose L.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Maxwell, Walter C.	do.	900
Himes, John C.	Laboratory assistant.	1,200
Sharpe, Mark C.	Inspector's assistant.	840

List of scientific and technical employees who have resigned from the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, since October, 1912—Continued.

Name.	Position.	Salary per annum.
Schultz, Henry M.	Veterinary inspector.	\$1,600
Drake, Roy N.	do.	1,800
Wolfe, James F. M.	Inspector's assistant.	1,000
Wilkins, Henry.	Meat inspector.	1,200
Pottelger, Clarence R.	Junior dairyman.	1,320
Gandy, Wiley N.	Agent in tick eradication.	840
Sachse, Herman F.	Meat inspector.	1,200
Miller, John F.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Putman, Emery.	Meat inspector.	1,200
Sullivan, David M.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Hurley, Daniel J.	do.	960
Graves, Roy R.	Dairyman.	1,620
Robertson, Thomas M.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Muldowney, Patrick H.	Veterinary inspector.	2,000
Grundy, George G.	do.	1,400
Burke, James W.	do.	1,400
McCartney, H. E.	Agent in dairying.	1,440
Ingraham, Harry C.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Gallagher, John J.	Veterinary inspector.	1,800
Balmer, William M.	do.	1,800
Allen, Clifford L.	do.	1,400
Beahm, Frank.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Thrower, John D.	Veterinary inspector.	1,900
Wilson, Jess.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Peterman, William J.	do.	840
Halpin, Thomas E.	do.	840
Butin, George E.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Cole, Clarence G.	do.	1,800
Bush, Roy F.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Fessenger, John G.	do.	960
Murphy, Glenn.	do.	900
Palmer, Leroy S.	Junior dairyman.	1,440
Silcox, W. H.	Agent in scabies eradication.	720
Simpson, John G.	Agent in tick eradication.	960
Oppenheimer, Ella.	Collaborator.	p. m. 25
Cooledge, Leslie H.	Agent.	900
Denman, William A.	Agent in tick eradication.	1,000
Crans, Merwin L.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Sprunger, George.	do.	840
Miller, Harry C.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Lynch, Charles F.	do.	1,400
Wolfe, David O.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Lewis, Watson.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Koontz, Harry F.	Meat inspector.	1,100
Davis, Brooke J.	Laboratory helper.	840
Smith, Roy E.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Corson, Charles.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Johnson, George A.	do.	2,250
Rinehart, Edward F.	Junior dairyman.	1,200
Fletcher, William T.	Assistant in dairying.	720
Farber, Harry S.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Huff, T. Barnett.	do.	1,620
McKay, John E.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Stokes, Albert J.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Williams, Albert E.	do.	1,400
Myer, Elisha.	do.	1,600
Sevy, Claude.	Agent in scabies eradication.	1,000
Caine, George B.	Agent in dairying.	1,200
Koen, Hardy G.	Inspector's assistant.	1,000
Trawver, Harry E.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Lawson, Frank W.	do.	1,400
Mitchell, Hallie A.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Burgett, Marion Vernon.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Murdoch, Dawson C.	do.	1,600
Ashbrook, Claude L.	do.	1,600
Faun, George C.	do.	1,600
Cory, Frank J.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Cater, Fred C.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Meredith, Alexander W.	Agent in tick eradication.	840
Utsler, Herbert C.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Horstman, Arthur W.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Hathaway, Louis.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Temme, Paul R.	Meat inspector.	1,000
Cohn, Jacob.	do.	1,000
Laird, Will R.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Gettelman, George A.	do.	1,600
Bruhn, Aksel T.	Junior dairyman.	1,200
Tieknor, Theodore O.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Beehdel, Samuel I.	Scientific assistant.	1,200
Day, William E.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Durfee, Clarence O.	do.	1,800

List of scientific and technical employees who have resigned from the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, since October, 1912—Continued.

Name.	Position.	Salary per annum.
Smith, Fred B.	Inspector's assistant.	\$840
Shanley, Joseph A.	do.	1,000
Fisher, Roy T.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Larson, Henry W.	Scientific assistant.	1,800
Sneed, Charles P.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Heathman, Martin J.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Youngblood, William	Agent in tick eradication.	1,800
McSparrin, Charles T.	do.	900
Moorman, Claude.	Agent in scabies eradication.	840
Moore, Charles Earl.	do.	720
Williams, James H.	Agent in tick eradication.	840
Downing, James H.	do.	1,000
Collins, G. C.	Agent in scabies eradication.	1,000
Murphy, John A.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Lollar, Ernest E.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Ward, George W.	do.	1,800
Kyger, Lem R.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Freemarek, George W.	do.	840
Bell, Charles M.	do.	1,000
Malloy, Edward A.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Hynes, William R.	do.	1,800
Rogers, John C.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Lee, Walker M.	Veterinary inspector.	1,620
Jay, Robert.	do.	1,800
Proper, Lewis J.	do.	1,620
Johnson, Howard C.	Inspector's assistant.	1,000
Titterington, Everett W.	do.	840
Arnold, Raymond.	Meat inspector.	1,200
Scates, John V.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Morley, Henry.	Stock examiner.	1,200
Williams, Frank E.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
McMaster, Harry W.	do.	1,600
Bryan, Walter N.	Meat inspector.	1,200
Kipley, Arthur W.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Lewis, Richard W.	do.	840
Ellis, Willis V.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Ainsworth, Frederick W.	do.	2,000
Whitaker, George F.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Conner, Dudley D.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Williams, John O.	Animal husbandman.	1,620
Carr, Ralph J.	Senior animal husbandman.	1,920
Conn, George M.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Ball, Edmund W.	Stock examiner.	1,200
Dahlberg, Arnold O.	Dairyman.	1,440
Egan, Harold E.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Eagle, John G.	do.	1,800
Fernow, Jess B.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Tate, Hiram L.	Veterinary inspector.	1,400
Travis, Don C.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Hardman, Herman L.	do.	840
Gordon, Waldron M.	Veterinary inspector.	1,900
Bux, Joe H.	do.	1,600
Kortenber, William C.	do.	1,400
Mattatall, Ira C.	do.	2,500
Peterman, Clyde M.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Troy, Oscar E.	Veterinary inspector.	1,600
Altman, Clarence R.	Inspector's assistant.	840
Whelan, Louis P.	Agent.	1,200
Simmons, George H.	Agent in tick eradication.	840
Rodgers, Elmer.	Agent.	1,200

Mr. WEAVER. Now the chairman has suggested that the resignations are falling off. The records of the Secretary of Agriculture will show the contrary to be true. It is true that the percentage of resignations the first year, at the time of the formation of the bureau, shows a much larger percentage of resignations than since the first year, because it is natural that many employees engaging for the first time in the work, a work of unusual hardships and exposure, should become dissatisfied and resign. But the records show that the percentage of resignations for 1912 was 5.79 and the percentage of resignations for 1913 was 6.27. I place in the record a letter

from Hon. David F. Houston, Secretary of Agriculture, of date April 11, 1914, to Hon. C. O. Lobeck, Member of the House of Representatives, and a statement accompanying the letter showing the number of employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry from 1906 to 1913, inclusive, showing the number of resignations each year and the percentage of the same.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 11, 1914.

Hon. C. O. LOBECK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LOBECK: Referring to your letter of April 6, 1914, I am inclosing herewith a statement containing the number of employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry from 1906 to 1913, inclusive, showing the number of resignations each year and the percentage of same, together with a list of scientific and technical employees who have resigned from the Bureau of Animal Industry since October, 1912. I regret that we are unable to give you any information regarding the present salaries of the employees who have resigned, as no record is kept of them after they have severed their connection with the department.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary.*

A statement containing the number of employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, from 1906 to 1913, inclusive, showing the number of resignations each year and percentage of same.

Year.	Employees in bureau.	Resignations during year.	Percentage of resignations.
1906.....	1,455	228	15.66
1907.....	3,182	261	8.20
1908.....	3,152	273	8.66
1909.....	3,268	191	5.84
1910.....	3,175	195	6.11
1911.....	3,199	205	6.40
1912.....	3,311	192	5.79
1913.....	3,380	212	6.27
Total.....	24,122	1,757	7.28

Mr. WEAVER. Now, Mr. Chairman, it looks like it is really a menace to this service when these men quit in this way—these efficient, thoroughly competent men, who have made this department famous all over the world as an efficient department—when they quit because it is not inviting to that class of men. These men entered the service with a definite promise for a definite increase of salary by continuing in the work a certain length of time. They continued in the work the specified time, but they have been denied the specified increase. And the worst feature of all, alarming, indeed, when we thoughtfully consider its effect on the service, is this: That the resignations are from the top, not the bottom; from the skillful, not from the unskilled, and the injury to the service is greater, not in arithmetical, but in geometrical, proportion. The strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link. The speed of the flight of a caravan through the desert is the speed of the flight of the slowest camel. When these skilled Government employees quit their jobs men lacking in experience take their places, and the Bureau of Animal Industry walks on lame and lagging feet and the whole Department of Agriculture suffers thereby. Classify this branch of the service. Give these men fair compensation for their toil, for the laborer is worthy of his hire. Report this Lobeck bill to the House, and I will prophesy

that the House will ratify your decision and these men will get justice and this branch of the public service be immeasurably strengthened and fortified.

I thank the committee very much for its kind attention.

Mr. LOBECK. I will now introduce Dr. S. J. Walkley, secretary of the National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, who has done efficient work in compiling data in support of this bill. Dr. Walkley is also a member of the American Veterinary Medical Association.

Mr. HAUGEN. Inasmuch as this matter has come up, I want to say this, that I have confidence in Dr. Melvin, and I believe every member of the committee has confidence in him. I believe the Government has an honest man in the service in Dr. Melvin, and I can not believe that he is guilty of repudiation, and while I wish to see the increase of salaries, I do not want it to come in that way, and I would like to have him explain it, in order that we may have this matter cleared up.

Mr. LOBECK. I join heartily with Congressman Haugen in that statement, because, in my personal experience, having one of the largest packing industries in the country in my district, I have met Dr. Melvin often and have found him most courteous, as I believe, perfectly competent and desirous of performing the duties of his office properly.

Mr. HAUGEN. There probably is some misunderstanding that can be cleared up very easily.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this the last argument that will be made?

Mr. LOBECK. It probably will be, although several Congressmen desired to be heard; but we have Mr. Pagle, secretary of Buffalo Branch, No. 22, of the association present. That will be all.

Mr. Moss. I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if this as going to be printed in the record, the committee should ask the department to give their reasons as to why these resignations took place. Since this question has arisen that the department has not kept its agreement, so far as these resignations have been made, if there have been reasons filed at the time the resignations were made, it seems to me that if the committee is going to get any value from this they ought to have the reasons given, as well as the fact of their resignation.

Mr. HAUGEN. The statement ought to give the number of people who served over two years, who went into the service with that understanding, that they were to be advanced after two years.

Mr. LOBECK. I think that in justice to the department that ought to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection we will get all that information.

Mr. Moss. I understand you to say that you wanted also the length of service?

Mr. HAUGEN. Just to clear up this misunderstanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is that we ask the Department of Agriculture to furnish us the names of those who have resigned within the last two years from the Meat Inspection Service, together with their reasons for the resignations.

Mr. HAUGEN. No; the number of people promised an increase after two years of service, and who were not granted the increase.

Mr. Moss. Now, my understanding in regard to that is that when this document is printed in accordance with Mr. Weaver's request, to make it of value to the committee we ought to have the reasons in

connection with the resignation, and my request is that the department furnish the committee with that information.

Mr. HAUGEN. I understood the witness to say that Dr. Walkley, the secretary, has the information and could get it up. If he has the information, very well; if not, I do not care to carry it further, but I know if there is any misunderstanding it is not due to Dr. Melvin. There is simply a misunderstanding, and probably there is some very good explanation for it.

STATEMENT OF DR. S. J. WALKLEY, SECRETARY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY EMPLOYEES; VETERINARY INSPECTOR, UNITED STATES BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY; MEMBER NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY AND PREVENTION OF TUBERCULOSIS, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Dr. WALKLEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I find that opinions differ greatly as to whether these salary schedules outlined in the civil-service manuals and civil-service notices should be termed "announcements," "statements," "promises," "contracts," "schedules," or "agreements." I will simply say, no matter what term is employed in this connection, it will not lessen the disappointment and inconvenience suffered by the employees. These schedules were announced by the Civil Service Commission, but they were never put into effect. Of course there may have been a few instances where they were, but the bureau in their various official announcements stated that they regretted that they could not put them into effect.

Now I trust, further, that you will not gain the impression that our association in organizing had any intention of taking advantage of these announcements of salary schedules. They were announced in 1907, but owing to the rapidly increasing high cost of living they would have become inadequate anyway, even if they had been put into operation. The increases that we are seeking average $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent over these schedules that were announced. In the case of clerks the Lobbeck bill only provides for a 25 per cent increase. Now, comparing the average increase that we are asking with the increase in the cost of living since 1907, we have official documents here, showing that the increase in the cost of living since that time has been about 49 per cent, whereas the most that we are asking for is $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent.

Now I wish to state one point clearly regarding the Lobbeck bill.

The bill is not intended to affect the employees of the meat inspection forces exclusively, but includes the forces engaged in meat inspection, Quarantine Division, field inspection, animal husbandry, dairying, export and import inspection, eradication of hog cholera, dourine, glanders, Texas fever tick, sheep scab, cattle mange, tuberculin testing—in fact, any employee in the United States Bureau of Animal Industry whose designation corresponds to those mentioned in this bill. In section 8 of the Lobbeck bill reference is made to the permanent appropriation of \$3,000,000 simply to call attention to the fact that some of the employees mentioned are at present paid from the meat inspection fund, whereas others are paid from different funds.

Referring to section 7, will say that when this bill was drafted we were under the impression that the clerks in Washington were already

classified, but I find now that they are not and that the clerks in Washington and those outside are on the statutory roll. Hence I respectfully request that the bill be amended so as to include the clerks in Washington.

In order to make the Lobeck bill more nearly perfect in a legal sense, Congressman Lobeck and I have agreed that the following changes should be made in same:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "at" and insert "on and after." Page 2, line 4, strike out "of." Page 2, line 15, strike out "of." Page 2, line 24, strike out "at" and insert "on and after." Page 3, line 10, strike out "of." Page 4, line 4, strike out "at" and insert "on and after."

The Lobeck bill provides for salary increases as follows:

Designation.	Present maximum.	Lobeck bill maximum.	Per cent of increase.
Veterinary inspector.....	\$1,800	\$2,400	33 $\frac{1}{3}$
Meat inspector.....	1,200	1,600	33 $\frac{1}{3}$
Inspector's assistant.....	1,200	1,600	33 $\frac{1}{3}$
Stock examiner.....	1,200	1,600	33 $\frac{1}{3}$
Clerks.....	1,200	1,500	25
Skilled laborers.....	900	1,200	33 $\frac{1}{3}$

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

A recent report by the Society for the Prevention of the Poor in New York shows that, getting along with the barest necessities, it requires between \$1,100 and \$1,300 to maintain a family of five and gives the following items allowed for expenses: Rent, \$237.25; food, \$473.73; clothing, \$158.04; fuel, \$16.42; lunches, \$32.48; dues, \$27.52; medicine, \$28.83; ice, \$18.25; ear fare, \$23.72; supplies, \$33.21; miscellaneous, \$35.40; total, \$1,085.19. There are some items enumerated here at an exceedingly low amount, as, for instance, lunches, \$32.48, which is 10 cents per day, whereas nothing is included for pleasures, medical bills, or education of children.

In March, 1913, I had an electrical company submit an estimate for some repair work. The work was done in December, 1913. In writing me, regarding the matter of cost of work being in excess of estimate, they stated in part as follows:

Will say that labor and merchandise has increased considerable since then, the labor alone has increased 25 per cent.

The following figures, showing the rapid advance in the cost of living as regards the "necessities of life," are found in the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin, Whole No. 140, dated February 10, 1914, giving a detailed report on retail prices from 1890 to December, 1913. (See p. 11).

	North central geo-graphical division.	United States.
Simple average of the relative prices of 15 principal articles of food in the year 1907....	127.3	128.0
Simple average of the relative prices of 15 principal articles of food in the year 1913, December.....	176.3	173.9
Increase, per cent.....	49.0	45.9

Page 12 of the same bulletin shows that during the 24-year period the lowest price in each of the geographical divisions and in the United States as a whole was reached in 1896, and that the highest price in the 24-year period was reached in November, 1913, in the North Central geographical division and in the United States as a whole.

In addition to the high cost of living, the United States Civil Service Commission is gradually raising the standard of requirements which makes it more difficult for employees to qualify for positions in this bureau. The following is an extract from the Twentieth Annual Report of the Bureau of Animal Industry for the year 1911, pages 13 and 14:

VETERINARY EDUCATION.

In order to obtain qualified veterinarians for its service the bureau, in conjunction with the United States Civil Service Commission, has continued its investigation and supervision with regard to the courses of study and facility for instruction at veterinary colleges. This work may be better understood from a brief review, including the circumstances leading up to it.

The veterinary inspectors of the bureau were placed in the classified service by executive order dated May 28, 1894, and the first examination was held by the Civil Service Commission June 22, 1894. To be eligible for the examination the only restriction made was that the applicant should be a graduate of a veterinary college. This remained in effect until July 1, 1899, when the standard was raised and the requirement made that the applicant should be a graduate of a veterinary college having a course of not less than three years. This was changed in January, 1900, to the requirement that veterinarians were eligible who were graduated during or prior to 1897 from veterinary colleges having a course of two years, while those graduated after that date must be from colleges having a course of three years. This standard was modified again in January, 1903, by requiring that applicants from a veterinary college having a course of three years must have spent at least two years in the study of veterinary science at a veterinary college. The necessity for this provision arose from the fact that certain veterinary colleges inaugurated the custom of giving degrees after one year of attendance and allowed two years' credit for time previously spent at agricultural, medical, or other colleges.

The demand for veterinarians for employment in practice and in the work of the bureau was so great that the existing veterinary colleges were not able to supply the requisite number. Some colleges did not give sufficient attention to the preliminary education of the student enrolled and were not particular as to the scope of the instruction given, the number of branches taught, and the length of the course. For this reason it was found that, although some of the graduates were able to pass the somewhat restricted civil-service examination, a considerable number were not sufficiently educated to make satisfactory inspectors and were not professionally qualified for the important duties assigned to them.

Accordingly, it was deemed advisable to adopt some means to designate the course of study as an adjunct to the examination which should be provided by colleges that wished to prepare graduates for the civil-service examination for veterinary inspectors. In order to obtain expert advice as to the subjects to be included in a proper curriculum and the amount of time (number of hours) to be devoted to each, the Secretary of Agriculture, in February, 1908, appointed five representative and qualified veterinarians as a committee on veterinary education, for the purpose of obtaining information regarding the course of instruction then given at veterinary colleges, and to make recommendations as to the matriculation examination and the course of instruction necessary to qualify graduates of these colleges for admission to the civil-service examination for the position of veterinary inspector in the Bureau of Animal Industry. This committee visited the various colleges for the purpose of obtaining the desired information and as a result of its inquiry made recommendations as published in circular No. 133 of the Bureau of Animal Industry. This circular was distributed generally, and most of the veterinary colleges proceeded at once to put the recommendations into effect. On January 21, 1909, on my invitation a conference of representatives of all the veterinary colleges of North America met at Washington to consider with the committee above mentioned the whole matter of matriculation and course of study. The committee's recommendations in the main were heartily approved by the conference, but it was decided to reduce the total

number of hours in the course from 3,200, as required by circular No. 133, to 3,000. By this reduction the student is still required to have instructions for $6\frac{2}{3}$ hours per day for 6 days per week for 25 weeks for 3 years in order to cover the required 3,000 hours. The Association of American Medical Colleges recommends in colleges for the study of human medicine a curriculum of $33\frac{1}{3}$ hours per week, while the present regulations for veterinary colleges require for day colleges $38\frac{2}{3}$ hours per week and for night colleges $29\frac{2}{3}$ hours per week. While night instruction is discouraged and has been practically discontinued by all but two colleges, it was deemed advisable to make provisions for it, as there seemed to be a demand for classes after office or work hours particularly in Washington. It was therefore decided to fix the course for night colleges at eight and a half months, exclusive of final examination and holidays, as compared with six and a half months for day colleges.

In the efforts to secure suitable veterinary inspectors properly qualified and educated in the veterinary profession there has been active cooperation of the United States Civil Service Commission, which brought about the issuance of regulations governing entrance to the veterinary-inspector examination, effective September 1, 1909, approved conjointly by the Secretary of Agriculture and the president of the commission. These regulations were published as Bureau of Animal Industry Circular No. 150, which contains a list of the accredited veterinary colleges, graduates of which can be enrolled for the veterinary-inspector examination. This list is subject to change, and any college failing to comply with the requirements is removed from the list until such time as there is faithful and explicit compliance.

The result of these measures has been not only to make it possible for the bureau to obtain men better educated and qualified for its veterinary work but to raise the standard of veterinary education in the United States and to provide students with larger and better facilities for study. Many of the veterinary schools have made large expenditures of money and have greatly augmented and improved their equipment and facilities since the regulations were issued. The majority of the schools have cooperated heartily with the bureau in bringing about improvement and have cheerfully complied with the official requirements. The officials of several schools have expressed their appreciation of the bureau's efforts and their desire that its supervision should be continued, etc.

The department assumes no direct authority or control over the veterinary colleges; it merely undertakes, in conjunction with the Civil Service Commission, to prescribe certain requirements for admission to the examinations for veterinary positions in its own service with a view to obtaining the services of qualified men. In order for the graduates of a college to be eligible to such positions the college must provide the required facilities for instructions.

The requirements that must be met by veterinary colleges in order to have their graduates become eligible for the examination for position of veterinary inspector in the Bureau of Animal Industry are set forth in Bureau of Animal Industry Circular No. 150 (issued Aug. 9, 1909). I shall be pleased to supply each member of your committee with a copy of that circular to-day.

These requirements for qualification being very rigid, has resulted in making the veterinary graduates of to-day valuable men to the live-stock interests and has created a great demand for their services, and the bureau finds it difficult to hold them for a great length of time at the present salary schedule. This condition will exist until the bureau can offer more attractive salaries. When the hazardous and unpleasant nature of the work of the veterinary inspector is considered the present salary is by no means commensurate with the duties performed. To illustrate the fact that remedial legislation is urgently needed by the employees of this bureau I will quote the following letter from the Idaho Department of Food, Drug, and Hotel Inspection, Boise, Idaho, dated April 1, 1914:

Hon. C. O. LOBECK,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of March 25, will state that our deputies are paid \$150 per month. I have one with me who was in the Federal meat inspection service for 11 years. Have five deputies at work. Have no civil-service examination but select them for the particular service needed.

I am glad some one is looking into this matter, for the employees of the Government in the Bureau of Animal Industry, as well as in the food and drug work, are very illy paid.

Any further information I can give you, I will be pleased to do so.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed) JAMES H. WALLIS, *Commissioner.*

Also the following letter from the Kansas State Agricultural College, department of veterinary medicine, dated Manhattan, Kans., March 30, 1914:

HON. C. O. LOBECK,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your inquiry of recent date, will state that the work in this department, in some instances, is work similar to a part of the bureau work. In others, it is entirely different.

Our salaries range from \$1,200 to \$2,700. It is seldom, however, that we pay less than \$1,500, ranging mostly to \$2,000.

I have noticed that a veterinarian who has the choice between entering this institution as an employee or taking up bureau work will take the former at a considerably lower salary, mostly for the reason that it offers a better opportunity for advancement, quicker advancement and much broader work. While the work in the bureau at times becomes monotonous it also results very frequently in narrowing the viewpoint of the man.

So far as the requirements are concerned, I believe that there is practically no difference excepting in individuality. There are no perquisites.

If I may mention the matter, will say that I am very glad that this matter is being considered by your honorable body, and trust that something will come of it. I do not believe that I am alone in being able to see the handwriting upon the wall to the effect that the bureau may soon have to take inferior material unless the salaries are raised. Neither do I think it strictly equitable to ask a young man to spend four full years in preparation for this work at the present high cost of living. A few years ago a three-year college course was all that was required.

If I can do anything further to help the good work on I will be very glad, indeed, to have you call on me.

Very truly, yours,

F. S. SCHOENLEBER, *Dean.*

KANSAS STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
Manhattan, Kans., April 13, 1914.

HON. C. O. LOBECK, *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter with reference to House bill No. 9292, will say that you are at perfect liberty to use any of my correspondence in any way you see fit if it will in any way help the cause.

I have carefully read said bill and find it very reasonable and just. Will take the matter up with our Congressman.

Had occasion to look up similar matters at Fort Riley a few days ago, and find that the Army veterinary bill is another bill which should be carried through, as there is no doubt but what some of the parties in Congress are not fully aware of the conditions which obtain in the Army. Frequently men of comparatively inferior education and training have greater opportunities than the professional veterinarian, and I certainly would like to see these two bills passed.

With reference to the four-year college course, I wish to explain that several of the State veterinary schools, among which is the Kansas State Agricultural College, are offering only a four-year course. I am safe in saying that within a few years all other veterinary colleges must come up to the same standard—in fact, they are seriously considering this step at present.

These matters were quite exhaustively discussed at several of the meetings of the Association of the State and Provincial Veterinary Colleges, of which I happen to be president, and I assure you that this association is heartily in favor of the bill you have presented.

I wish to say further with reference to this institution that the Bureau of Animal Industry draws only our very poorest graduates, the men who are either too theoretical or conservative of energy, as our very best men will not consider the salaries. If these salaries were raised, no doubt the bureau would get some of our better men, which they

ought to have. I think I can safely say that such is the case to a great extent with most every other institution. Very few of our graduates in private practice, after the first year, make less than \$2,500 per year and from that up. You can readily see why our best men will not consider a position in the Animal Industry Bureau.

I trust that you will be able to place this bill upon the statute books, and assure you of our hearty cooperation, and wish to say further that we certainly appreciate the interest you are taking in this matter.

Very truly, yours,

F. S. SCHOENLEBER, *Dean.*

Also the following letter from the dean of the North Dakota Agricultural College, department of veterinary medicine, dated Agricultural College, North Dakota, March 28, 1914:

Hon. C. O. LOBECK,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of the 25th instant I beg to say that for so far as it is possible to carry this plan into effect we insist that the veterinarians employed by this institution have not less than a high-school education or its equivalent before engaging upon their professional training, and that they receive the latter at a school requiring the same entrance conditions and which does not graduate its students in less than three collegiate years of nine months each.

At the present time we have only in our employ those who are engaged for the entire year, with the exception of one month's vacation, and we pay them an entrance salary of \$1,600 per annum. After satisfactory service of two years this is increased to \$1,800, and in two years more this is increased to \$2,000. After that the increases come according to ability shown and the conditions governing the financial status of the institution.

This, of course, is no hard and fast rule, but we aim to keep closely to this program.

The employees of this institution have no perquisites, such as free house rent, etc.

Yours, very truly,

L. VAN ES, *Dean.*

EXPOSURES.

The inspectors in the Bureau of Animal Industry are exposed to dangerous diseases and serious accidents, and their occupation is regarded by all authorities who have observed the work as a hazardous occupation. The following letter from Dr. Hoyt E. Dearholt, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Anti-Tuberculosis Association and director of the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, shows the opinion of authorities on sanitation and hygiene regarding this occupation:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *February 10, 1914.*

Dr. S. J. WALKLEY,

185 Northwestern Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR DR. WALKLEY: During a recent visit of inspection to one of the largest and best of the local meat-packing plants I was struck with the apparently remarkable efficiency of the Government inspectors. It was a matter of wonderment to me that so high a class of scientifically trained men would accept employment in this work. My wonder increased when I was told, at my own solicitation, what pay the Government allowed for this service.

The zeal, thoroughness, and thoughtlessness of self reminded me of that displayed in hospital and post-mortem research of large hospitals. The latter workers, however, are in training for lucrative private practice or fame in medical research. With the Government inspectors, ante mortem and post-mortem, I couldn't see the same incentive to risk of life and health in the service.

The work must be disagreeable. It is unquestionably attended by danger of disease from the enormous amount of diseased tissues handled. The pressure under which the work is prosecuted makes "safety first" consideration almost impossible for the inspectors themselves. The nature of the work calls for exposure to cold and wet. That these are calculated to invite diseases other than those which might be contracted from diseased animal tissues is certain. All of which warrants the belief that meat inspection is a hazardous occupation.

The increases proposed in the bill (H. R. 9292) appear to me to be extremely reasonable. I sincerely hope that the efforts being made to secure its passage will be successful.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

HOYT E. DEARHOLT, *Executive Secretary.*

The inspectors in the Bureau of Animal Industry in their line of duty come in contact with quite a number of cattle suffering with tuberculosis, to which disease they are thus exposed. The following is an extract from a letter from Dr. Livingston Farrand, M. D., executive secretary of the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, dated at 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York City, January 20, 1914:

Dr. SEYMOUR J. WALKLEY,
Milwaukee, Wis.

MY DEAR DOCTOR: The national association has officially recognized the close relation between bovine and human tuberculosis and has by special resolution urged both the tuberculin test of cattle and the pasteurization of milk as desirable and necessary preventive measures. The association has furthermore by special resolution recognized the valuable work of the veterinary medical profession in its efforts to prevent the spread of tuberculosis.

On the killing floors in the packing houses the inspectors are confronted with the liability of injury from slippery floors, falling carcasses, accidental falling of travelers and other overhead equipment, knives in the hands of careless butchers, exposure to cold, drafty, and damp killing rooms. The following letter shows that physicians and surgeons recognize the dangers connected with this work:

CUDAHY, WIS., *February 13, 1914.*

Dr. S. J. WALKLEY,
*Veterinary Inspector, United States Bureau of Animal Industry,
185 Northwestern Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.*

DEAR DOCTOR: Referring to our conversation to-day, will say that the bronchitis with which you are at present suffering is one that is ordinarily amenable to treatment. But your statement to the effect that you are at present inspecting in the beef-killing department, where it is necessary to walk in water and blood, on wooden, brick, and cement floors, and to inhale steam and vapors, and to pass at frequent intervals from the beef-killing floors, where the temperature averages about 80° F., and go into the beef chill room, where the temperature averages only about 34° F., explain the delay in your recovery, as it could hardly be expected that this condition would yield to the usual treatment as promptly as it would if you were working in a dry or normal atmosphere.

It is to be regretted that the above-mentioned changes in temperature are made so suddenly that you can not properly protect yourself by making a corresponding change in your clothing.

Another undesirable feature about your case is the fact that it becomes necessary for you to handle such a large amount of tubercular tissue, especially at this time, while the inflammatory condition of your bronchial tract is still in evidence, as tuberculosis is more easily contracted and enjoys a more rapid progress in a damp atmosphere than in a dry or normal atmosphere.

Fraternally, yours,

(Signed)

A. C. SIDLER, M. D.

Dr. Sidler has practiced medicine for many years in Cudahy and Milwaukee, Wis., and among his patients are a large number of the packing-house employees, as well as the inspectors at those plants, and he is therefore in a position to know of the peculiar conditions under which the bureau inspectors perform their duties and the relation of these conditions to human health. In addition to the experience he has gained from administering to the ills of his patients, he has on many occasions visited the packing houses and witnessed the bureau work.

Dr. Ravenel advises that his investigations developed the fact that 20 per cent of the hogs slaughtered in Wisconsin were affected with tuberculosis. This means that 600 or more tubercular animals are frequently found in one day's kill of hogs in large packing plants, and the disease is often present in its most virulent and dangerous type. The inspection being performed with the bare hands at such great speed, the hands are often wounded by the sharp knife used in incising and excising the glands and other tissues that harbor the tubercule bacilli, it is no wonder that some of the inspectors succumb to the disease.

In cases where inspectors suffer wounds with knives that are contaminated with tubercular material the mental anguish is intense, due to the thought that he has probably inoculated himself with the germs of tuberculosis, and that he may become one of the victims of the "great white plague."

In order to definitely determine the exact stage of development of tuberculosis, it often becomes necessary for the inspector to crush portions of the tubercular material between his fingers in order to determine from the sense of touch what disposition to make of the carcass. In view of the speed at which the inspection is conducted it is often impossible for the inspector to take precautions necessary to protect himself from disease. If the eyeglasses of an inspector should fall while he is manipulating tubercular tissues, they are liable to become contaminated with the germs. There was an instance where one of the inspectors, who had some trouble with his eyes, called upon an eye specialist in Milwaukee, and after he had explained the nature of his work the specialist suspicioned tuberculosis of the eye. The thought of an inspector unconsciously carrying these germs of tuberculosis into his home and communicating the "great white plague" to members of his family, who are near and dear to him, are not very pleasant, and yet the inspector may reasonably entertain this fear. The inspectors in the Bureau of Animal Industry work faithfully to protect the public at a point where the public can not protect themselves, and in doing so they are continually jeopardizing their own health. They are in addition thereto underpaid for their services.

Public sentiment has never been more strongly in favor of an efficient meat-inspection service since *The Jungle* was printed than it is at the present time. In some foreign countries the slaughtering business is regulated to accommodate the inspectors, especially as to speed, while in this country the inspectors are required to perform their duties as rapidly as the modern requirements of the establishment permit or demand.

The following is an extract from United States Bureau of Animal Industry Circular No. 25, page 26 (being a reprint from the Twenty-third Annual Report of the Bureau of Animal Industry, 1906).

INSPECTION IS ADAPTED TO PACKING BUSINESS.

The department provides a sufficient number of inspectors for this work and insists that they be furnished every facility in the way of space and light. Here, as elsewhere, it seeks to accommodate its inspection to the business of the owner of the abattoir. Within reason it will require its men to work as long as his, to begin as early, and continue as late. The inspectors will work as fast as the improving appliances of the establishment permit or as its needs demand, and the bureau will not require the proprietor to stop his work to send for the inspector or to wait while the inspector returns

to his office and makes out an elaborate report—a procedure which is common in the inspection systems of some foreign countries. It requires only that notice be given of the hour that work is to begin, and its men will be on hand and ready to begin. In short, the Bureau of Animal Industry also specializes in its inspection service, and claims to be as modern and as up to date as the finely organized business it supervises.

Bureau of Animal Industry order No. 150, regulations No. 8, section 1, reads as follows:

NOTICE OF DAILY OPERATION, ETC.

The manager of each official establishment shall inform the inspector in charge, or his assistant when work has been concluded for the day, and of the day and hour when work will be resumed. Under no circumstances shall any department of an establishment be operated except under the supervision of an employee of the Bureau of Animal Industry. All slaughtering of animals and the preparation of meat and meat-food products shall be done within reasonable hours, and with reasonable speed, the facilities of the establishment being considered.

An inspector on duty at one of the large establishments going at its full capacity will inspect a beef in 48 seconds, and he must necessarily be quite agile and expert to detect tuberculosis and other diseases that are communicable to human beings as the carcasses pass along. It is therefore obvious that the inspector works under an intense nervous strain, and in his effort to maintain an efficient and dependable inspection, he must exercise the greatest possible thoroughness of manipulative skill.

Appeals have gone forth from every civilized nation to save life from the ravages of the great white plague, and much money and energy has been and is still being spent for its control and eradication, yet scarcely a thought is given by the general public for the lives of the inspectors who are earnestly engaged in the task of protecting the homes of the Nation by eliminating tubercular and other infectious carcasses from the trade and supervising their entire destruction, through proper tanking facilities, from use as meat or meat-food products.

As further evidence of the dangers attending the inspection work, I respectfully quote an extract from the Text Book of Pathology, by Joseph McFarland, M. D., professor of pathology and bacteriology, in the Medico-Chirurgical College, Philadelphia, pathologist to the Philadelphia Hospital, and to the Medico-Chirurgical Hospital, Philadelphia, page 33:

Butchers and veterinary surgeons may inoculate themselves with tuberculosis from animals they dissect.

In case a bureau employee becomes infected with tuberculosis in the line of duty he is doomed to be dismissed from the service, as shown by the Bureau of Animal Industry Order No. 150, regulation 10, section 7 (p. 12), which reads as follows:

Persons affected with tuberculosis or any other communicable disease shall not be employed in any of the departments of establishments where carcasses are dressed, meat is handled, or meat-food products are prepared, and any employees of such establishment who may be suspected of being so affected shall be reported by the inspector in charge to the manager of the establishment and to the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

There are also dangers from other infectious and contagious diseases. See McFarland's Pathology, page 33, which shows that man may become affected with glanders from horses, mules, and

asses, and "cow pox was first observed upon the hands of milkmaids and dairymen, resulting from contact with diseased cows' udders." The following letter shows the great number of dangerous diseases to which the bureau inspectors are exposed in the performance of their official duties:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1914.

HON. C. O. LOBECK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 20th ultimo, requesting information relative to the number and nature of the diseases to which the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry are exposed in the discharge of their duties as veterinary inspectors, meat inspectors, etc., in the packing houses and stock yards and on stock farms, and as investigators and workers in the scientific laboratories of this bureau.

In reply, you are advised that the following list includes those diseases to which employees of this bureau may be exposed in the discharge of their duties:

Septicemia, often fatal, but curable if taken in time. Pyemia, curable. Tuberculosis, curable if taken in time. Rabies (hydrophobia), curable if treated soon after infection occurs. Tetanus (lockjaw), curable if treated shortly after infection occurs. Glanders, usually fatal. Anthrax, usually fatal. Actinomycosis, usually fatal. Foot-and-mouth disease, curable. Malta fever, rare in this country; often fatal. Typhoid fever, often fatal. Echinococcus infection, usually fatal. Sarcoptic mange of the horse, curable. Sarcoptic scab of sheep, curable. Sarcoptic scab of goat, curable. Sarcoptic scab of hog, curable.

Laboratory workers, as well as veterinarians and meat inspectors working in and about packing houses, are exposed to most of the foregoing diseases, as these diseases are being investigated from time to time in the scientific laboratories of this bureau.

Veterinarians attached to the Field Inspection Service are liable to infection with the following diseases, in addition to those mentioned above: Rocky Mountain spotted fever, incurable. Malaria, curable.

I have endeavored to make the foregoing lists of diseases as complete as possible, and shall be glad to furnish any additional information you may desire.

Very truly, yours,

A. D. MELVIN, *Chief of Bureau.*

Your attention is directed to the case of one William Baker, a victim of blastomycosis, which was contracted by him in the line of duty as an inspector in post-mortem work for the State of Illinois at the Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill. Blastomycosis is communicated by horses and cattle to man, and when the disease becomes systemic, by attacking the lungs and the liver and other internal organs, which is always possible, the disease is incurable. The disease greatly resembles and is often mistaken for syphilis or tuberculosis of the skin. In the above case the State of Illinois appropriated \$10,000 for the relief of Mr. Baker. (See Illinois Session Law, vol. 1913, p. 79.) There are a large number of inspectors in the Bureau of Animal Industry performing work similar to that performed by Mr. Baker, and yet under the existing laws, if they should become victims of this disease, they would receive absolutely no compensation whatever, except 15 days sick leave, plus 15 days annual leave. Does it seem consistent that these inspectors should be asked to work in water and blood, and inhale vapor and steam, being exposed to these dangerous diseases without being paid salaries that are commensurate with this class of work?

Dr. Eckl, veterinary inspector of Brooklyn, N. Y., died of tuberculosis, and it is generally believed by the bureau inspectors in the East that he contracted the disease in line of duty.

Dr. A. M. Irwin, veterinary inspector at South St. Joseph, Mo., contracted tuberculosis of the finger while in the performance of his official duties.

Your especial attention is directed to the facts as pointed out in the letter of Dr. A. D. Melvin, dated April 8, 1914, that some of the diseases to which the employees of this bureau are exposed are absolutely incurable. In some cases these diseases terminate in death very quickly.

The following is an extract from Friedberger and Frohner's *Veterinary Pathology*, page 352:

Anthrax in man is chiefly found in knackers, butchers, tanners, herdsmen, and veterinary surgeons, in consequence of an infection acquired whilst cutting up the cadavers, and it generally assumes the forms of carbuncles (malignant pustule) on the arms, face, neck, etc. The appearance of the pustule is followed by fever, and usually by death. Intestinal anthrax mostly occurs from eating infected flesh.

Many of the inspectors in the Bureau of Animal Industry are often troubled with a most severe and painful irritation of the hands and arms, due to coming in contact with hogs while in the performance of their official duties. This trouble is known in packing house parlance as "hog itch."

The bureau inspectors find it necessary to wear waterproof boots for protection from blood and water, and some of them wear boots with wooden soles. These boots cost from \$4 to \$6 per pair, and they only last on an average about five or six months, due to the destructive effect of the blood in the slaughtering departments and of the brine in the curing departments.

Florens McCarthy, meat inspector of Brooklyn, N. Y., was absent from duty on sick leave for nearly three months in the year 1913 and he attributes that sickness to the unusual hours of his work. It was necessary for him to arise at 3 a. m. each day. Just previous to his breakdown he was working in a packing house where the temperature did not exceed 17 degrees above zero at any time for three weeks and Mr. McCarthy states that he was unable to sleep sufficiently in the afternoon or early evening, which resulted in a nervous breakdown from insufficient sleep. In many cases the slaughter and packing houses are drafty and this is responsible for colds and much other sickness suffered by the inspectors.

In the case of inspectors in the killing departments and in other departments where the reinspection of meat and meat food products is conducted, there is the danger from moving trucks, machinery, exposure, slippery floors, and the sudden change from the freezing temperature of coolers to the extreme high temperature of lard-rendering rooms, tank rooms, etc., these changes often resulting in rheumatism, pneumonia, pleurisy, bronchitis, catarrh, and similar conditions. It is generally known that some of these cases terminate fatally. One of the inspectors in Chicago, Ill., who died a few years ago of pneumonia, stated to some of his fellow inspectors, prior to his demise, that he was positive that the pneumonia resulted from a sudden change of temperature while on duty as an inspector for the Bureau of Animal Industry at the packing house.

The following are a few examples of the many sudden changes in temperature that it is necessary for the inspectors to make in the performance of their official duties:

From—	Temperature.	To—	Temperature.
	° F.		° F.
Beef killing room.....	80	Chill room.....	34
Packing room.....	80	do.....	34
From lard refinery.....	90 to 110	do.....	32
Dry salt packing room.....	80	do.....	34
Freezers.....	0 to 15	Lard refinery.....	90 to 110
Do.....	15	Beef killing.....	80
Do.....	15	Packing room.....	80
First beef chill room.....	40	Second beef chill room.....	35
Beef chill rooms.....	35 to 40	Lard refinery.....	90 to 110
Dry salt chill room (cellar).....	34 to 36	do.....	90 to 110
Sweet-pickle chill room (cellar).....	34 to 36	Sweet-pickle packing room.....	80

Regarding the dangers involved in these sudden changes of temperature, your attention is directed to McFarland's Text Book of Pathology, page 31, which reads as follows:

2. *Exposure*.—Occupations that bring men into exceptionally high artificial temperatures for considerable periods, as in stoking furnaces, baking bread, casting steel, etc., are usually associated with an unusual degree of activity of the skin. When such persons go into a cold atmosphere, the sudden chilling of the surface of the body, with the determination of the blood toward the internal organs, may result in serious disturbances of the lungs, kidneys, and other organs. Acute congestion of the lungs, and acute nephritis have been thus occasioned.

Harry Smith, who was an inspector of meats that were microscopically inspected for trichinæ in Chicago, Ill., had to go from the Government office, where the temperature was from 60° to 75° F., to the microscopic cellars, where the temperature averaged about 34° F. Mr. Smith contracted follicular tonsilitis, a most severe and painful form of tonsilitis. He was absent from duty for about two weeks, and his doctor bills amounted to about \$25.

William F. Brown, meat inspector, Brooklyn, N. Y., absent from duty 14 days suffering with an inflammatory condition of his right eye, which was diagnosed by an eye specialist as retinitis. The specialist stated that the inflammation was probably occasioned and was certainly aggravated by the constant changes from rooms that were cold to rooms where the temperature was warmer, and by the drafts around the packing house.

On April 7 Mr. Brown's sick leave for the year 1914 had been exhausted, but the inflammation of his eye had not disappeared but had subsided sufficiently to permit him to perform his official duties. Up to April 7 he had incurred a medical bill of \$70 as a result of this inflammation.

In the killing departments the inspectors suffer from the inhalation of steam and vapors. Some of the vapors emanate from the carcasses when they are eviscerated; but the greater amount of vapors during the winter months are due to the excess of cold air suddenly admitted to the department where the temperature is warmer. This vapor is often so dense that an inspector can not see a butcher 3 or 4 feet distant, and every butcher around him is continually moving to and fro with a sharp knife or other sharp instrument in his hand, and it is nothing uncommon for workmen to cut each other under those circumstances. There is also a great amount of free steam in the atmosphere in these killing departments, and this steam is charged with the characteristic odors of the animals in that department. The inspectors

inhale this steam, which acts as an irritant to the nose, throat, and bronchial tubes, as does the vapor, and excites catarrh, bronchitis, asthma, etc. Inhaling the steam and vapor also serves to saturate the body and the clothing of the inspectors with the characteristic animal odors, and it thus becomes necessary for the inspectors to discard their packing-house clothing at the end of the day, but even then the odors have been taken up by the body and are often recognized by other passengers on trains or street cars, which proves humiliating for the inspector. This is true of inspectors in the hog-killing departments. The inspectors in the stockyards also take up the animal odor, especially when they come in contact with hogs.

Many of the meat inspectors in the chill rooms work by artificial light three-fourths of the time, which is a severe strain upon the eyes.

Among the many dangers to which the inspectors are exposed are the following:

The ante-mortem inspectors (stock examiners) are in constant danger of injury from vicious animals and accidents in going through crowded stock pens. When a farmer enters a pen with his cattle, he knows the cattle and knows which of them are vicious and which are gentle. It is different with the stock examiners, as they are examining different lots of cattle in the pens each day, and they are all strange to the inspector. He simply has to take a chance and is often attacked by vicious animals, which has resulted in surgical operations and permanent physical injury. One case in particular is that of Richard Walsh, who was kicked in the abdomen by a Texas steer while performing his duties in the ante-mortem inspection in the Union Stock Yards at Chicago. He found it necessary to enter the pens to make a thorough inspection of the cattle. The kick that he received resulted in his being ruptured and necessitated a surgical operation. This was several years ago, but he has never fully recovered.

In the antemortem inspection, the stock examiners enter the crowded pens to attach "suspect tags" to those animals that show symptoms or are suspected of being affected with any disease or condition which under the regulations would probably cause their condemnation in whole or in part when slaughtered. Inspectors who make the tuberculin tests at dairy farms in order to determine whether or not the cattle are affected with tuberculosis also come in direct contact with the animals, and many of them are kicked by the animals. Many of the inspectors are carrying accident insurance at their own expense.

WORK OF BUREAU INSPECTORS HAZARDOUS.

The following is a copy of a letter from a responsible insurance company:

Dr. S. J. WALKLEY,

*Secretary National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees,
185 Northwestern Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.*

DEAR DOCTOR: Concerning the matter of rate for accident insurance for Government inspectors who make antemortem and post-mortem inspection of live stock in and around packing houses and dairy farms:

You, of course, appreciate that there are certain hazards connected with your business that are not found in a risk that is doing office work or that does not require coming in contact with dangerous animals, and you are required to make tests for tuberculosis

and actinomycosis, also must go out testing for glanders in horses, and must handle diseased meats, subjecting you to septicemia, therefore we must secure an adequate premium to cover this extreme hazard which our experience has shown to be \$8.50 per thousand.

Our rate for veterinary surgeons who treat diseased animals is \$10 per thousand, but we understand that your work does not require treating such diseased animals, merely inspecting same and determining whether or not the subject is fit for food consumption, etc. The same rule holds true in life insurance: For instance, at the age of 35 for a 20-payment life policy, the normal premium is \$29.32 per thousand, but for anyone employed in and around stockyards or tanneries, etc., we fix an additional premium of \$3.25 to cover such extra hazards.

We should be very glad to entertain your application for either accident or life insurance, and feel sure that we can give you complete protection at the lowest possible cost, when the hazard of your work is thoroughly understood.

Dr. F. A. Hugins, veterinary inspector in the Bureau of Animal Industry, was employed several years ago in an office in a clerical capacity, at which time he took out an accident policy with an insurance company, the cost of which was \$5 per annum. In December, 1913, company wrote him a letter inquiring whether or not he had changed his occupation since taking out the policy. He reported that he was now employed as a veterinary inspector and that his duties consisted in the ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection of food animals around packing houses and stockyards. The following is an extract from the letter that he received in reply:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 16, 1913.

We have forwarded your letter of the 7th instant to our home office, and are to-day in receipt of a letter instructing us to rewrite your accident policy, inasmuch as your duties have been changed to a more hazardous class. The premium will be at the rate of \$10 per thousand, instead of \$5, as now written.

We are inclosing a new application which we will thank you to fill out and sign and immediately upon its receipt we will issue new policy and forward to you.

INJURIES.

The following are examples of the class of injuries peculiar to employees of this bureau, including details not shown in official records of Bureau of Labor statistics:

Physicians have reported cases of ringworm syeosis in men, who probably contracted it from animals.

One physician in Chicago has seen two cases of acute pemphigus in sheep butchers at the Union Stockyards. (See p. 275 of Dr. W. A. Pusey's book on Skin Diseases.) A type of pemphigus first described by Pernet.

Dr. O. W. Noyes, veterinary inspector (p. o. box 734, Valentine, Nebr.), was driving on the range on March 9, 1911, inspecting cattle for the bureau. In crossing a wire fence the team became frightened and ran away, entangling him in the barbed wire and dragging him, which resulted in his right ankle being lacerated so badly by the wire that he found it necessary to go to the hospital for treatment. He then went on crutches the entire summer, and to-day finds it necessary to carry a cane. At present he can walk only a short distance, even with the aid of a cane. The circulation in his right ankle is so impaired that two toes were frozen on February 4, 1913, and three toes were frozen on February 3, 1914, while performing his regular official duties. His hospital fee and surgeons' fees with subsequent medical bills totaling over \$600 were paid by him.

The following item illustrates the hazards connected with the bureau inspection. This item is copied from the American Veterinary Review of July, 1909, volume 35, No. 4, pages 490 to 491:

We are indebted to Dr. James F. Ryder, inspector in charge at the port of Boston, for the following authentic account of the horrible affair that took place in the packing houses at Somerville, Mass., on June 5, last:

"Yours of the 7th at hand. The affair mentioned happened at just 2 p. m., on June 5 at the North Packing & Provision Co., Somerville, Mass. Hogs were being killed at the rate of 560 per hour; John Murphy, whose work consists of cutting the hogs heads nearly off, exposing the cervical glands so that the inspector can see them, was at work on the moving table; next to him stood Dr. Daniel S. Hays (Harvard) Government inspector. Dr. Hays was bending over a hog when Murphy suddenly drew his 10 inch knife across the back of Dr. Hays's neck, exposing the cervical vertebræ.

Dr. Hays turned, and then Murphy plunged the knife in the left side of the abdomen and turned the knife. The intestine was completely severed in one place and hacked in others. About 6 inches of omentum protruded from the wound. At the hospital about 6 inches of intestine was removed and the ends brought together by the use of the Murphy button. Dr. Hays rallied and to-day (June 8) the surgeons inform me he has about an even chance for recovery. After attacking Dr. Hays, he (Murphy) rushed from floor to floor, stabbing any one he met. Five men were killed and four badly injured. Dr. Fred Saunders (A. V. C.), veterinary inspector, had a very narrow escape. Murphy was within a few yards of him before the doctor saw him, but managed to get in a cooler and pull the door shut. Murphy was captured in the cellar, a raving maniac."

Dr. Hays was under the care of a physician in the hospital for 25 days and convalescing at home until August 21, 1909, making a total of 77 days absent from duty. As a result of this accident Dr. Hays was also obliged to take six days off during the following September. He lost his salary for 27 days, and in addition thereto paid his own hospital and other bills resulting from this unfortunate affair.

Another sad case is that of inspector's assistant E. L. Moore, of South St. Joseph, Mo., which is a matter of official record (see Bureau of Labor Statistics, case No. 26069). Mr. Moore was inspecting the submaxillary glands on hog heads. The packing house employee was severing the head in a manner that left the glands in the neck exposed insufficiently for a proper inspection to be made. Mr. Moore endeavored to demonstrate the proper method of exposing the glands in order to facilitate inspection. The bench upon which they were standing was very slippery, and while Mr. Moore was making the demonstration his feet slipped and the knife was drawn across the under part of his arm about 6 inches above the wrist. All of the flesh, arteries, nerves, etc., were severed as deep as the bone. It is quite probable that Mr. Moore's arm will never be as strong as it was prior to this accident. The total period of disability was 23 days. It became necessary for Mr. Moore to be absent from duty without pay for the remaining days of December. He had previously taken up all of his sick and annual leave during the year 1913, as he had the misfortune of stepping on a nail during the earlier part of the year. He had already used all of his sick leave and part of his annual leave for the year 1914. His rate of compensation is \$840 per annum, which is entirely inadequate, especially in cases of this nature. His fellow inspectors made up a purse for him which relieved the situation to a certain extent, temporarily. On February 19, 1914, his indebtedness for medical bills amounted to nearly \$500. The salary of \$70 per month will not permit Mr. Moore to meet these obligations very rapidly.

The following is an extract from Bureau of Animal Industry Service announcement No. 14, June 15, 1908, page 63:

ASSAULT ON BUREAU INSPECTORS PUNISHED.

"In the Federal court at Indianapolis on May 20 last, Fred Waldsmith and Edward Clouser, employees of W. C. Routh & Co. (establishment No. 592), Logansport, Ind., pleaded guilty to the charge of assault upon United States Meat Inspector David M. Coppock while in discharge of his official duties, and were fined by the court."

Mr. Coppock was about 51 or 52 years of age, and these men attacked him in the lard refinery at night, cursed him and beat him, kicking him after he had been knocked down. It is my understanding that the two packing-house men were fined \$100 each.

Dr. Sid Galt, Livingston, Ala., while inspecting cattle on December 14, 1909, was thrown by a horse and suffered a fracture of both bones of left leg just above ankle and tibia just below the knee. The bones did not unite on account of compound-comminuted fracture of both bones. In July, 1910, he went to hospital and had leg resected and surgeons removed 1½ inches bone, which left him crippled for life. His ankle is stiff. He was under heavy expense all this time and went on crutches about 18 months. He lost 52 days without pay after using vacation and sick leave. His salary at that time was \$1,400 and now it is only \$1,600 per annum. He was appointed after examination, October 1, 1907.

By way of comparison I wish to cite the case of one William Bell, a repair or trouble man for the Bell Telephone Co. of Buffalo, N. Y. He was injured about five months ago, while riding on a motor cycle, by colliding with a motor truck. Several bones of his leg were fractured. This accident was not due to any negligence on the part of the telephone company and yet they have been sending Mr. Bell's salary to him at the hospital and they are also paying all of his hospital bills. Mr. Bell is still in the hospital. This telephone company also furnishes free medical attention to all their employes.

W. W. Leech, inspector's assistant, was cut in the hand while performing his official duties in a slaughterhouse in Brooklyn, N. Y., about March 10, 1914, and blood poisoning developed. All of his sick leave was used while recovering from this injury.

We will now presume that Mr. Leech applies for his annual vacation about June 15, 1914. If there are a sufficient number of inspectors in Brooklyn, N. Y., he will in all probability be allowed his 15 days' (annual vacation) leave with pay. If Mr. Leech should suffer another injury in the line of duty prior to having used his annual leave (vacation) of 15 days, it would become necessary for him to draw on the 15 days' annual (vacation) leave while recovering from the injury, in order to avoid losing his salary. If Mr. Leech should apply for his annual vacation (leave with pay) prior to any further injury or sickness and should be granted the leave and use it all, and later in the year be so unfortunate as to suffer another injury in the line of duty, as a result of which he could not report for duty for six weeks or six months, his salary for the entire time would be lost under the existing law.

INSPECTOR SCALDED.

It will be probably many years before the packing-house employees at the Union Stock Yards of Chicago, Ill., will forget the pitiful case of Thomas Smith, a bureau inspector, who was scalded while in the performance of his official duties. Mr. Smith was either breaking a seal or sealing the draw-off of a condemned tank and slipped off the board that extended across the vat below the draw-off, and he fell into the vat, the contents of which were scalding hot. He climbed out of the vat and hurried to the Government office, and when his fellow inspectors removed his clothing the skin peeled off with them. He died in a few days as a result of this injury.

Now, regarding the number of resignations per month, I have statistics here regarding that, and I can read them now or extend them in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. In that connection, will your statistics show that within the last two years the resignations have been decreasing rather than increasing?

Dr. WALKLEY. We have the statistics here from the department that give that fully.

Mr. REILLY. As our time is short, suppose we just put that in the record.

Dr. WALKLEY. Congressman Weaver has placed them in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. I desire to say that it has been called to my attention that I had a statement from the Department of Agriculture some time ago to the effect that the resignations have been steadily decreasing in this service. I am not quite sure that my memory is correct on this proposition, but that is my recollection.

Dr. WALKLEY. The Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Dr. Galloway, under date of March 21, transmitted to Congressman Lobeck, under inclosure No. 3209, a statement of resignations among the classes of employees represented in the Lobeck bill since 1906, and I notice here that this year, up to March 12, 14 veterinarians had resigned. That is over one month ago, and I have statistics here showing that the resignations are gradually taking place since then. There were 2 meat inspectors up to March 12, 10 inspectors' assistants, 2 stock examiners, and 7 clerks in the field.

Mr. SLOAN. Is that the calendar year you are speaking of, or the fiscal year?

Dr. WALKLEY. That covers from January 1 to March 12 of this year, as I understand the report.

Mr. HAWLEY. Have you got it there by years in totals, for 1912, 1913, and 1914?

Dr. WALKLEY. Yes; they are as follows:

1906.....	159
1907.....	217
1908.....	126
1909.....	143
1910.....	141
1911.....	124
1912.....	144
1913.....	135
1914, to Mar. 12.....	30
Total.....	1,219

Mr. REILLY. What percentage of these are veterinarians?

Dr. WALKLEY. There are 386 veterinarians. I have not figured the percentage.

Mr. REILLY. Then about one-third—about 33½ per cent of the employees covered by this bill are veterinary surgeons.

Dr. WALKLEY. As they are at present. Of course these figures fluctuate, as the employees are resigning, etc., but on March 7, 1914, there were 2,855 employees in the bureau who would be affected by this bill, of whom 1,063 were veterinary inspectors.

Mr. REILLY. What is the highest salary that an inspector gets, per day?

Dr. WALKLEY. Of the rank and file, \$1,800 per annum is the highest that the veterinary inspector can expect to go.

Mr. REILLY. Those are inspectors?

Dr. WALKLEY. We have several grades of them. Now, for meat inspectors, the usual average maximum is \$1,200.

Mr. REILLY. He is a kind of professional man, is he?

Dr. WALKLEY. No, sir.

Mr. REILLY. Then why should he get any higher pay than, for instance, a mail carrier?

Dr. WALKLEY. These men are trained in this work. They have had years of experience in the packing house. They are skilled in the curing and processing of meats. They have a highly-developed sense of smell. If you should put a letter carrier into the packing house he would not care to last five days.

Mr. REILLY. And if you put a meat inspector on a letter carrier's job he might not last one day.

Dr. WALKLEY. If I had my choice between the two jobs at the same rate of compensation I would choose the letter carrier's job, as I then would not have to work in blood and water, and would not need to wear big boots and overalls.

Mr. HAUGEN. You have 1 meat inspector at \$1,600 and 39 at \$1,400, according to the estimate.

Dr. WALKLEY. You probably have the figures there. You will find that the meat inspectors drawing those high salaries are few in number. Congressman Lobeck has called upon the Department of Agriculture to furnish statistics regarding employees at South Omaha, Nebr.; Kansas City, Mo.; Kansas City, Kans.; and Milwaukee, Wis., and here they are [indicating]:

The service history in the Bureau of Animal Industry for each employee at those stations appears on a separate card, as follows:

Milwaukee, Wis.: One inspector in charge, 14 veterinary inspectors 20 meat inspectors, 4 inspector assistants, 1 laborer, 2 clerks, 7 stock examiners; total, 49.

Kansas City, Kans.: One inspector in charge, 64 veterinary inspectors, 76 meat inspectors, 38 inspector assistants, 4 laborers, 6 clerks, 16 stock examiners, 3 miscellaneous; total, 208.

Kansas City, Mo. (field): Seven veterinary inspectors, 4 inspectors' assistants, 1 clerk, 7 stock examiners, 1 miscellaneous; total, 20.

South Omaha, Nebr. (yard): One inspector in charge, 2 veterinary inspectors, 5 inspector assistants, 1 clerk, and 6 stock examiners; total, 15.

South Omaha (meat inspection): One inspector in charge, 34 veterinary inspectors, 47 meat inspectors, 34 inspector assistants, 3 laborers, 4 clerks, 12 stock examiners; total, 135.

Congressman Lobeck says he will place these statistics at the disposal of the committee. On the cards that I have here is shown the name of the employee, his date of entrance into the service, his entrance salary, and the date of his respective promotions, and the salary to which promoted in each case. You will find by an examination of these cards that the employees who entered the service in the same grade during the same year, did not receive their promotions during the same year, but that the promotions have been irregular. That is the reason I can not give the exact figures regarding the maximum, because at the present time there is no law regulating these salaries.

Mr. HAUGEN. As to the veterinarians, according to the estimate, there are 768 receiving over \$1,400 and 141 at a salary of \$1,400.

Dr. WALKLEY. I presume your figures are correct, but I can not verify them.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is the estimate.

Dr. WALKLEY. I can not verify those because I have no statistics on that line. But the purpose of the bill is to establish a uniform system of compensation, so that we will not have two men of the same designation who are working in the same office, doing practically the same amount of work in the service about the same length of time, who are equally efficient, but not receiving the same rate of compensation.

The CHAIRMAN. In that connection your bill does not provide for any test of efficiency as a basis for promotion. Now, as I understand it, promotions in the Post Office Department are made after the Post Office Department has satisfactory evidence that the employee is entitled to the promotion on the basis of efficiency. Would you be willing to accept a provision of that kind in the bill?

Dr. WALKLEY. Yes, sir. You will find, upon referring to our constitution and by-laws, that our preamble provides for increasing the efficiency of the service.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand also that examinations are made once a year of all postal employees in order to get the satisfactory evidence upon which the promotion is made. Would you be willing to do that?

Dr. WALKLEY. In this bureau and in the Postal Service the scope of the work is entirely different, and I would not agree to that as especially applying to the medical end of it, because it is a well-known fact that the best practicing physician in the city of Washington to-day might not be able to pass an examination that could be given him by a university man, or rather by an authority on medicine; an examination could be given him that would be so rigid that it would be absolutely impossible for him to pass it; and yet that physician is thoroughly competent to call at your home, prolong your life, and properly care for members of your family in their hours of illness.

The CHAIRMAN. I know, but you would not go on the assumption that they were going to give an examination that nobody could pass?

Dr. WALKLEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I presume that the Post Office Department could give its employees such an examination that none of them could pass it, but you have got to go on the assumption that the examination will be a reasonable test of their efficiency. You would not be willing to have that inserted in your bill?

Dr. WALKLEY. Our executive committee is in favor of promotions being based upon efficiency. They feel that the bureau could determine the efficiency better from observation of the employee and their work. The disease proposition is different from that of the distribution of mail. Animal inspection presents a different case, and a great deal depends upon the employee's judgment at a particular stage of the game.

The CHAIRMAN. If your idea is correct, that the department is in a better position to determine the efficiency of the men, have you not brought them back to the present status?

Dr. WALKLEY. If you base your examination in this bureau upon the test that the Postal Service bases theirs upon; that is, a knowledge of rules and regulations, and speed and accuracy, then I believe the comparison is proper. I might say here that a written examination would give a check on the knowledge of the employee regarding rules and regulations, but in this bureau, where the work bears such a close relation to the problem of public health, it would seem of far greater importance to determine whether or not the knowledge is being properly applied.

The CHAIRMAN. We assume that the examination would be based upon the idea of developing the efficiency of these employees, and if such an examination were held would you have any objection to it?

Dr. WALKLEY. Not at all. We are willing to stand examinations for efficiency and subsequent promotion on the same basis as the Army and Navy surgeons are given examinations along the lines of their duty prior to promotion.

The CHAIRMAN. You say your organization has been formed for the promotion of efficiency in the service?

Dr. WALKLEY. That is the idea. I told Dr. Galloway, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and also Dr. Melvin, the chief of the bureau, after my arrival at Washington, that we were willing and that we expected to give efficient and satisfactory service before expecting any increase in salary.

In order to show how an association of this character may operate to strengthen the efficiency of the service, I respectfully quote the following extract from a letter from the secretary of our Wichita, Kans., branch, regarding one of the branch meetings:

A number of the members were selected to obtain a list of questions on the rules and regulations pertaining to meat inspection and these questions were then answered by different members and were open for discussion, etc. This feature is interesting and educational, as it gives the employee a better knowledge of the rules and regulations and enables him to accomplish more and better work. Samples of different food products were obtained and were examined by those present for the purpose of ascertaining their knowledge of the different products.

I might say that at the present time the employees of this bureau are being rated as to efficiency. I think you will find that they have records in the department showing the efficiency of our men in the

service, and the efficiency ratings at the present time are based upon observations of superior officers, the people who are capable of judging our capacity and efficiency as well as our executive ability. I am not, however, familiar with all the details regarding the present efficiency system used by the Bureau of Animal Industry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does not that fly in the face of your own position? The theory of your bill, as I understand it, is that you are to provide for the automatic promotion of the employees, and to get away from the idea that your superiors show any favoritism among the employees. Now then, the proposition that I suggested a moment ago was to make the test of efficiency an examination, and then there could not be any charge of favoritism upon the part of your superiors—is not that what you are trying to do?

Dr. WALKLEY. Yes, sir; I believe your suggestion is a good one. I believe, further, that the questions of punctuality and devotion to duty should be factors in the determination of efficiency.

Mr. REILLY. If automatic promotions were provided for, how could the department get rid of mediocre men?

Dr. WALKLEY. Why, simply by not giving them an examination or promotion.

Mr. REILLY. In your bureau we will assume you are an expert, and that Mr. Jones, who has been employed for some time, is a mediocre man; he is not good enough to be promoted, and not bad enough to be discharged, and under those circumstances, what is Dr. Melvin going to do?

Dr. WALKLEY. Well, he can punish him by not advancing him in salary.

Mr. REILLY. That would not do, because under your bill he automatically goes up.

Dr. WALKLEY. We are now suggesting efficiency——

Mr. REILLY (interposing). Well, then, if he has the right to punish him, why has he not the right to exercise discrimination, which is the thing you want to abolish by the terms of your bill?

Dr. WALKLEY. I do not believe Congress would ever give a department the power to discriminate. We have just shown that they have power to remove an employee for cause at any time they see fit. I believe the proper procedure is to give the employee a hearing, as provided in Public Document No. 336, H. R. 21279.

Mr. REILLY. That is for cause, but how is the mediocre man to be removed? It seems to me that the same thing should be done here as is done in educational institutions, where the mediocre man gets no raise and goes out, whereas if you have an automatic system the mediocre man stays in and you can not put him out.

Mr. LOBECK. But if he is not a competent man he is not promoted.

Mr. MOSS. If there was an efficiency standard agreed upon in the bill would you be willing that provision should be made that after a person had stayed in the service a certain time and his ratings for efficiency did not come up to the standard, he should automatically drop out of the department, provided the department wanted him to go?

Dr. WALKLEY. Well, I hardly think so, because it would seem that as long as he had remained in the service this long that his services

have been satisfactory. But I would not say that a grossly inefficient and incapable employee should remain in the Government service. A demotion or reduction in salary at least would be indicated in the case you cite.

Mr. MOSS. If we are to give promotions based on efficiency and avoid the possibility of keeping in the service inefficient men, then I wanted to know whether we could not apply an efficiency standard which would guarantee, on the one hand, increases in salary where the employee deserved it, and, on the other hand, automatically throw a person out of the service, provided he did not keep his work up to the standard of efficiency as measured by the efficiency standard. I wanted to know whether you would agree to that and whether your association would accept it.

Dr. WALKLEY. I hardly believe that would be fair to all concerned. That principle has never been applied to any other department of the Government.

Those with whom I would be inclined to deal most liberally in this connection are the employees who have become inefficient on account of old age. Since they have given the best of their lives to the Government service it would be most unkind to dismiss them. The efficiency of the Federal service in general could be strengthened if the aged and infirm could be replaced through retirement legislation.

I feel and am glad to say that many of our friends in Congress have expressed the belief that there is no more important bureau in the public service than the Bureau of Animal Industry, and it naturally follows that men of special training, skill, moral stamina, and courage are needed to enforce the law. But it would be absolutely impossible to put your proposed plan into operation successfully prior to having instituted a salary schedule that is commensurate with the work. The present salary schedule will not attract the proper talent with which to fill the places of the inefficient.

Mr. MOSS. Then if I catch your idea, you want an efficiency standard which would give increases in salary but have no demotion effect?

Dr. WALKLEY. It would keep the inefficient from advancing—that is, the general run of men, with ambition and pride, upon seeing their fellow men advance would either keep up with that standard of efficiency or would step out of the service.

If there is any bureau in the public service in which it is important that a high standard of efficiency be maintained it is in the Bureau of Animal Industry. I have great faith in Dr. Melvin, and I know that he would not jeopardize the health of the public by keeping inefficient employees on the pay roll. Our association positively does not stand for the inefficient employee. The purpose of this bill is to secure a salary schedule that will attract capable men and that will reward efficient service. We admit that it would not be consistent for us to anticipate promotions except upon evidence satisfactory to the Department of Agriculture of the efficiency and faithfulness of the employee during the preceding year. In order to show that the Bureau of Animal Industry does not make it a practice to keep in-

efficient employees on the pay roll I will quote the following dismissals from the service:

Service announcement.	Date.	Number dismissed.	Month.
1.....	May 15, 1907	17	April, 1907.
2.....	June 15, 1907	1	May, 1907.
3.....	July 15, 1907	5	June, 1907.
4.....	Aug. 15, 1907	4	July, 1907.
5.....	Sept. 16, 1907	4	August, 1907.
6.....	Oct. 15, 1907	6	September, 1907.
7.....	Nov. 15, 1907	3	October, 1907.
8.....	Dec. 16, 1907	1	November, 1907.
9.....	Jan. 15, 1908	1	December, 1907.
10.....	Feb. 15, 1908	1	January, 1908.
11.....	Mar. 16, 1908	4	February, 1908.
12.....	Apr. 15, 1908	2	March, 1908.
13.....	May 15, 1908	1	April, 1908.
14.....	June 15, 1908	3	May, 1908.
15.....	July 15, 1908	2	June, 1908.
16.....	Aug. 15, 1908	1	July, 1908.
17.....	Sept. 15, 1908	3	August, 1908.
18.....	Oct. 15, 1908	4	September, 1908.
19.....	Nov. 16, 1908	1	October, 1908.
20.....	Dec. 15, 1908	1	November, 1908.
21.....	Jan. 15, 1909	8	December, 1908.
22.....	Feb. 15, 1909	2	January, 1909.
23.....	Mar. 15, 1909	1	February, 1909.
24.....	Apr. 15, 1909	1	March, 1909.
25.....	May 15, 1909	1	April, 1909.
26.....	June 15, 1909	2	May, 1909.
27.....	July 15, 1909	2	June, 1909.

The following is a statement of the number of removals for delinquency and misconduct in the Bureau of Animal Industry since January 1, 1909:

	Number.
1909.....	34
1910.....	26
1911.....	29
1912.....	18
1913.....	20
1914 (to date).....	2

You may therefore rest assured that if you report favorably upon the Lobbeck bill the danger of the inefficient employees advancing in the service or even remaining in the service will not be any greater than it is under the present system.

Mr. LOBECK. There would be an incentive for keeping up to date in their work and in their duties so that they might be advanced?

Dr. WALKLEY. Yes, sir. The more thoroughly you provide an efficiency system the better service you are going to get, because it stimulates a spirit of rivalry and no man wants to see his fellow workers, right in the same office, get ahead of him. If two employees enter the service about the same time, with the same qualifications and both render satisfactory service, it seems that they should receive the same salary increase and at about the same time. If provisions were made for following up that system the service would be materially improved.

Mr. SLOAN. Does this bill recognize the matter of efficiency as you are discussing it? Would it not have to be radically and materially amended in order to emphasize that apparently new feature?

Dr. WALKLEY. Yes, sir; it will have to be amended. That is a matter to be left to your committee and to the body administering the law. The question of efficiency, of course, is a very deep problem,

and one that has never been discussed at any of our national conventions. As I take it, your honorable chairman has in mind the efficiency tests of clerks in the postal branch of the Government—and that branch is very efficient to-day—and I believe they test their efficiency based upon punctuality, devotion to duty, accuracy, speed, and respect for superior officers, and then demerits are given for insubordination. Those things, we admit, are just and proper. In other words, we do not expect any increase in salary in the absence of good work, because we want to increase the efficiency of the service.

The CHAIRMAN. But I understood you to say a moment ago that you had never discussed this problem of efficiency in your national conventions?

Dr. WALKLEY. No, sir; we did not discuss that at our last convention.

The CHAIRMAN. But I understood you to say a little while ago that your organization was predicated upon the idea of increasing efficiency, and yet you never discussed the proposition.

Dr. WALKLEY. We discussed it in a limited way, but we did not go into the details of outlining plans for determining the efficiency of the individual employee.

Right here I will quote from the preamble of the national constitution of this association:

To secure, through cooperation with the Bureau of Animal Industry, more equitable salary rates, regulation of hours of labor, and to promote the efficiency of the service; to secure for the bureau employees full benefits of all laws now existing, and which may be hereafter enacted, and by the upholding at all times of civil-service rules and regulations.

Efficiency rating is a deep problem, and one in which very broad principles are involved. I question whether by any system of marking the true all-around efficiency and capacity of the human worker can be determined with any great degree of perfection. It should be remembered that for years the efficiency rating system applied to the railway postal clerks was by them considered absurd, and I understand that the postal department has recently substituted a consistent, unitary, and well-thought out scheme for rating efficiency. Let us hope that whatever system is finally used in determining our efficiency it will not operate to the disadvantage of an efficient employee.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Dr. WALKLEY. Now, we are only asking that you put this department on an equality with some of the other departments. At present I shall not compare the employees in this bureau with employees in the commercial world, but merely with those in other branches of the public service. In the Army, for instance, the veterinarians have a chance to go up to about \$2,700 per year, including free house rent that they are allowed, and they are not absolutely prohibited from carrying on private practice in case it does not interfere with their official duties, but the employees of this bureau are strictly prohibited from doing that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that true? Are not your veterinarians considered scientific employees, and under the present law is it not possible for them to attain a salary of \$4,000 a year? And I might suggest that we have just raised the limit \$500, and if a bill which is now

pending in the Senate becomes a law it will permit promotions to \$4,500. Is not that true?

Dr. WALKLEY. I presume it is, and I am truly glad to hear that. The rank and file at the present time do not know that.

Naturally the veterinary inspector is included in the group of scientific employees. This information will be gladly received by the veterinarians along the line, who are working in water and blood, wearing boots and overalls. But if you will report favorably upon the Lobeck bill it will afford immediate relief. I believe, however, that the fact that the veterinary inspector has a chance of working up to \$4,000 or \$4,500 should be made generally known, as it would attract better talent to the service. Again, there are good men who would not be attracted so readily by the hope of \$4,000 as they would by the assurance of \$2,400.

In this connection I wish to cite the following resignations at Washington, D. C., during the past year:

Dr. T. Casserly, entered private practice of veterinary medicine.

Dr. J. N. Hornbaker, who was assigned to duty in the pathological division, resigned to accept appointment in the War Department at Front Royal, Va., which position pays an entrance salary of \$1,700 per annum, plus free house rent. The Army veterinarian is not strictly prohibited from practicing veterinary medicine where it will not interfere with his official duties. This is a privilege that is denied the veterinarians in the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Under date of March 21, 1914, the Adjutant General's office at the War Department, at Washington, D. C., gave the following information regarding the veterinarians in the United States Army:

Veterinarians when appointed are assigned to regiments of Cavalry and Field Artillery. They receive the pay and allowances of a second lieutenant of Cavalry—\$1,700 per annum, with 10 per cent increase for each period of 5 years' service up to 20 years, and quarters. They are not commissioned officers but wear the uniform of a second lieutenant without the shoulder straps.

Competitive examinations are held from time to time at Army posts in different parts of the country for the purpose of testing the fitness of applicants for appointments as veterinarians, and anyone desiring to take the examination should make application in writing to the Adjutant General, War Department, Washington, D. C., inclosing proper testimonials. There are no printed blanks furnished by the War Department to be used in making application.

Applicants must be citizens of the United States, not less than 22 or more than 35 years of age, must be graduate of some recognized veterinary college, of good moral character, and physically sound, etc.

It will be thus seen that at the end of 5 years the Army veterinarians' salary will be increased to \$1,870; at the end of 10 years it is increased to \$2,057; at the end of 15 years it is increased to \$2,262.70, and at the end of 20 years it is increased to \$2,488.97, and in addition thereto the Army veterinarian has free quarters. In view of this fact and in consideration of the hazardous nature of the work in which the Bureau of Animal Industry veterinarians are engaged, it would seem that the maximum of \$2,400 for which H. R. 9292 provides is entirely reasonable. The Bureau of Animal Industry veterinarians do not receive allowances for house rent as is the case with the Army veterinarians.

The following notice regarding outside practice appeared in Bureau of Animal Industry service announcements No. 28, August 16, 1909, page 68:

OUTSIDE PRACTICE BY VETERINARY INSPECTORS NOT PERMITTED.

(File J.)

In circular letters issued in the past the bureau has indicated that it did not approve of veterinary inspectors in its employ conducting veterinary or medical practice outside of official hours, although they have not been prohibited absolutely from responding to an occasional call from a personal friend, performing minor operations occasionally, examining horses for soundness, etc., provided they did no advertising, exhibited no professional signs, nor in any other way solicited practice. On account of numerous complaints received, however, from veterinarians not in the federal service, and who have no means of support outside their veterinary practice, the bureau now finds it necessary to direct that all veterinary or medical practice of any nature whatever be discontinued entirely by all veterinary inspectors in the bureau. This notice revokes all previous circular letters or individual letters on this subject to the contrary. Inspectors in charge will report promptly any information received by them to the effect that any veterinary inspector in the bureau service is disregarding this notice.

The following letter is self-explanatory:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF THE QUARTERMASTER CORPS,
Washington, April 7, 1914.

Hon. C. O. LOBECK, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LOBECK: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt, this date, of your letter of April 6, asking to be advised as to whether the rules and regulations prohibit the veterinarians of the Quartermaster Corps from practicing veterinary medicine provided that it does not interfere with their official duties, and in response thereto to advise you that I can find no law or regulation prohibiting the practice you refer to, but the department does not encourage its employees in their endeavors to compete with practitioners residing in the same vicinity.

Very truly yours,

J. B. ALESHIRE,
Chief, Quartermaster Corps.

In order for a man to properly prepare for a veterinary inspector's examination as required by the United States Civil Service Commission it is necessary for him to spend from \$2,500 to \$3,000. It does not seem reasonable to expect him to spend that amount in training to qualify for this work and then to work for \$1,800 per annum, especially since the work to which they are assigned involves the risk of life and limb, with death and disease on every hand.

If Congress would provide a definite salary schedule for the employees of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, we believe that the department will cease to be drained each year of a number of its experienced men. In many cases the places of those who leave are filled by inexperienced men.

Now, veterinarians in the colleges and universities throughout the country are paid anywhere from \$1,800 to \$3,000, as shown by the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
Washington, March 23, 1914.

Hon. C. O. LOBECK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LOBECK: In reply to your letter of March 21, I beg to advise you that this bureau does not have at hand detailed information regarding the qualifications demanded of persons for positions as teachers of veterinary science in the various universities and colleges in the United States. I may say, however, that it is undoubtedly required that such persons be graduates of courses in veterinary medicine

in veterinary schools or of veterinary courses in universities and colleges. The compensation of teachers of veterinary medicine varies in the different States and depends also upon the grade of teaching position held by the person, such as professor, assistant professor, or instructor. Teachers of veterinary medicine in the following States are employed at salaries as indicated:

Alabama: \$2,500.
 California: \$1,900, \$2,200.
 Colorado: \$1,000, \$2,100, \$2,000, \$1,700, \$1,800, \$1,700.
 Delaware: \$2,000.
 Idaho: \$800.
 Illinois: \$2,500.
 Indiana: \$2,400.
 Iowa: \$2,200.
 Louisiana: \$2,400.
 Maine: \$1,700.
 Maryland: \$1,800.
 Massachusetts: \$2,620.
 Michigan: \$1,766, \$1,600.
 Minnesota: \$3,200, \$1,800.
 Missouri: \$1,500, \$3,000, \$500.
 Montana: \$2,100.
 North Carolina: \$2,000, \$1,300.
 North Dakota: \$3,000, \$2,000, \$2,000.
 Ohio: \$3,000, \$3,000, \$2,750, \$2,500, \$1,900, \$1,600.
 Oregon: \$1,000.
 South Carolina: \$2,000.
 South Dakota: \$2,280, \$900.
 Tennessee: \$780.
 Texas: \$2,500, \$2,000, \$1,075.
 Utah: \$1,200.
 Vermont: \$2,000.
 Virginia: \$2,300.
 Washington: \$1,400, \$1,600, \$2,000, \$3,000, \$1,700, \$1,500.
 West Virginia: \$900.
 Wisconsin: \$3,266, \$2,450.

Trusting that this information will be of some service to you, I am,
 Yours, respectfully,

L. A. KALBACH, *Chief Clerk.*

And now consider the clerks in the Reclamation Service. At Portland, Oreg., during the year 1913, L. C. Pratt, clerk-typewriter, salary \$900 per annum, resigned to accept a similar position in the Forest Service at \$1,100 per annum; C. W. Johnson, clerk-typewriter, at Portland, Oreg., resigned in the year 1913, salary \$900 per annum, to accept a similar position in the Reclamation Service at \$1,100 per annum. Now, if \$1,100 is paid as an entrance salary in the Forest and Reclamation Services, why not provide that much for employees in this service? The work in this bureau is essentially of a scientific and technical nature and naturally the longer a person is in the service the more valuable his services become to the bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. You realize, of course, that transfers are being made in the Government service almost every minute in the day, some with promotions and some with demotions, yet you certainly would not use that argument in favor of this bill?

Dr. WALKLEY. Well, they would not leave this bureau to go over to the Weather Bureau unless conditions are more desirable there.

For example, at Fort Worth, Tex., on May 19, 1913, Perry R. Hill, inspector's assistant, was transferred from the Bureau of Animal Industry to the Weather Bureau at Portland, Oreg., to accept a more desirable position, and has since received an increase in salary.

The lack of funds in the Bureau of Animal Industry suggests the thought that Mr. Hill would not have yet received an increase had he remained in this bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you made any investigation to find out whether anybody has come from the Weather Bureau into the Bureau of Animal Industry?

Dr. WALKLEY. There are a few of them.

The CHAIRMAN. I know of cases in my own experience.

Mr. REILLY. Is it always your experience that the longer a man stays in the Government service the more efficient he becomes and the more valuable to the Government?

Dr. WALKLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. REILLY. Does not that depend upon the man?

Dr. WALKLEY. Well, it does to a certain extent. I called at the Civil Service Commission offices a few days ago. The clerks in that office receive from \$840 to \$2,400, and I will show you how to get good work out of a man. I was gathering these statistics to be used in these hearings, and I was there until pretty nearly 6 o'clock, at which time there were only two or three men left. One who was still there with us received \$2,400 a year, while the great army of men getting those smaller salaries had gone; but the man who was getting the higher salary was devoted to his duty and was not watching the clock to see when it was time to leave.

Mr. REILLY. And I will guarantee that that man was promoted on merit and for ability displayed while he was in the lower ranks.

Dr. WALKLEY. I do not doubt it. I want to tell you just how this failure to receive increases has affected individual employees. I will take my own case, and you can verify it from these cards which Congressman Lobeck has gotten from the department. The difference in the salary that was scheduled for me and that which I have received is almost \$1,000. There are a large number of men throughout the country who have assumed financial obligations, with this schedule in mind, that they can not meet, and it has proven very embarrassing to them, which naturally has not resulted in the betterment of the service.

Mr. SLOAN. What salary do you draw now?

Dr. WALKLEY. \$1,600. I have been serving as a veterinarian since 1907, and my superior officers have told me, "Your services, Doctor, are very satisfactory; your record is good, and we do not know why you have not gotten an increase." One of the officers said, "If you do not get it pretty soon, remind me of it, and I will write in to Washington for you." But in view of these various and sundry announcements I did not worry the chief any more, because I thought it would be useless. My record as a veterinary inspector is as follows:

I was appointed as a veterinary inspector on May 20, 1907; entrance salary, \$1,400 per annum. According to the schedules announced I should have enjoyed the following promotions: June 1, 1909, to \$1,600; June 1, 1911, to \$1,800.

But the schedule was not carried out and the promotion to \$1,600 that I should have received on June 1, 1909, was not received until June 1, 1911. The promotion to \$1,800 that I should have received

on June 1, 1911, has not been made, and the difference is figured as follows:

Salary as per schedule, June 1, 1907, to May 30, 1909, two years, at \$1,400 per annum.....	\$2, 800
Salary as per schedule, June 1, 1909, to May 30, 1911, two years, at \$1,600...	3, 200
Salary as per schedule, June 1, 1911, to May 30, 1914, three years, at \$1,800 per annum.....	5, 400
Total.....	11, 400
The salary that I have received:	
June 1, 1907, to May 30, 1911, four years, at \$1,400 per annum..	\$5. 600
June 1, 1911, to May 30, 1914, three years, at \$1,600 per annum.	4, 800
Total.....	10, 400
Total difference in salary as scheduled and salary as received.....	1, 000

In figuring the above I am, for the purpose of convenience, presuming that I have not lost any salary due to being absent without pay on account of sickness or other causes and that I shall not receive an increase in salary prior to May 30, 1914. An effort to be extremely accurate as regarding these two features might probably change the figures slightly, but the same general principle would still be involved.

The CHAIRMAN. If this committee continues to increase these inspection funds in the next 10 years as it has done in the past 2 years, will not that fact accomplish the very purpose you desire? Are you not looking more for an increase of salary than anything else in this proposition?

Dr. WALKLEY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not say that in a spirit of criticism; that is all right, but if we can get it to you in the regular way, depending upon your chiefs to pass upon your efficiency and your right to promotion rather than to fix it automatically, would you not be satisfied?

Dr. WALKLEY. I do not think the desired purpose can be accomplished, except through the salary schedule. The association is not alone in seeking this schedule; the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, who administers the law, has pointed out clearly that the employees will become disgruntled and dissatisfied if they do not have a specific salary schedule, and he has urged that the employees be given that schedule; so it is not the employees alone. (See Dr. Melvin's annual report for year 1912, as quoted by Congressman Weaver.)

Mr. MAGUIRE. Do you not think the salaries are more nearly equitable now than the salaries that were fixed away back 20 years ago, and do you not think there are fewer inconsistencies that have grown up in this line of the service than in all the different branches of the department among the employees and specialists?

Dr. WALKLEY. Well, that is no doubt true, and I want to say that we have not departed to a great extent from the schedules that the Civil Service Commission announced. I mean as regarding the entrance salaries.

There are quite a number of employees in the bureau service who state positively that they would never have taken up this line of work had it not been for these salary schedules being announced. The employees who have served the bureau faithfully and have every reason to believe that their services were satisfactory, natu-

rally feel discouraged with the existing conditions. As the salary promotions specified in the official announcements of the United States Civil Service Commission became overdue, the employees naturally became disgruntled and dissatisfied and a large number of them wrote to the bureau officials for information regarding the delay. The following public announcements regarding this matter were made by Dr. A. D. Melvin, Chief of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry:

[Service Announcements No. 26, June 15, 1909, p. 50.]

PROMOTIONS DELAYED FOR LACK OF FUNDS.

On account of a considerable increase in the cost of inspection, due to the constantly increasing number of establishments under Federal inspection without a corresponding increase in the funds appropriated for carrying on the work, the bureau now finds it impossible to adhere to the schedule of promotions which have in the past been announced in connection with the positions of veterinary inspector, stock examiner, and inspector's assistant. As a result a number of employees have unfortunately failed to receive the promotions which they expected and which the bureau fully intended to make as planned. Nevertheless the bureau wishes to assure all faithful employees that their work is appreciated and that their cases will be considered just as rapidly as possible.

In view of this notice inquiries on this subject from bureau employees are being filed without reply.

[Service Announcement No. 32, Dec. 15, 1909, p. 102.]

LACK OF FUNDS PREVENTS PROMOTIONS.

Referring to the notice in service announcement for June, 1909, to the effect that the consideration of promotions must be delayed at least until January 1, 1910, and to the notice in service announcements for November with reference to the necessity for retrenchments in meat-inspection expenditures, the expenditures so far made from the appropriations for the current fiscal year have nearly exhausted the funds allotted for the various kinds of work for the portion of the year which has thus far elapsed, and the possibility of making promotions in the near future is very doubtful. The chief of the bureau greatly regrets this condition, but there appears to be no relief possible until more funds are available for the bureau's work.

[Service Announcements No. 77, Sept. 15, 1913, p. 84.]

PROMOTIONS OF EMPLOYEES.

In view of numerous communications received relative to veterinary inspectors and inspector's assistants not being advanced in salary as soon or as often as was expected, the following information is given for the benefit of all concerned:

Early in the year 1907 a plan was outlined whereby veterinary inspectors should enter the bureau service at \$1,400 per annum and be advanced to \$1,600 after two years' satisfactory service, and to \$1,800 after two years' additional satisfactory service at \$1,600; also that inspector's assistants should enter the service at \$840 per annum and be advanced to \$1,000 after three years' satisfactory service, and to \$1,200 after three years' additional satisfactory service at \$1,000, and after passing an examination. In a number of announcements for examinations the Civil Service Commission outlined this plan. These announcements were made in good faith, and at the time it was fully expected that the plan would be followed. However, on account of necessary expenditures in the extension of the service, it has not been possible to promote employees as proposed, and after this became evident the Civil Service Commission omitted any reference to such promotions.

Promotions of employees on account of length of service and efficiency will continue to be made, but as the possible number depends entirely on the funds available the bureau is unable to adhere to any fixed plan as to the length of service for promotions.

Regarding the salary schedule for stock examiners, will say that the reference to same made in Service Announcement No. 26, June 15, 1909, page 50, is the only announcement that I can locate relating to that schedule, and am not able to state what the schedules were.

As a result of failure to receive promotions the employees are dissatisfied and many of the capable and trained men are leaving the service for more lucrative employment, either in other branches of the Federal service or in the commercial world outside. This has naturally hampered the work of the bureau to a great extent. The work of this bureau is essentially of a scientific or technical nature and is of vast importance in the conservation of the live-stock industry of the country. If suitable provision were made by Congress for the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry to be paid equitable salaries, the bureau could attract and hold more permanently the class of men that they desire and thus be better enabled to maintain the high standard of efficiency that is so important in a bureau where the work is so closely connected with the problem of public health, and the health of the meat consuming public would be more materially safeguarded.

It is very essential that our inspection system be kept up to a high standard of efficiency if we expect foreign countries to allow our live stock, meats or meat food products to be exported. The greater the number of inexperienced inspectors there are in the service the greater will be the danger of diseased meats entering into interstate and foreign commerce. Since the Bureau of Animal Industry has already experienced considerable disappointment and the loss of services of valuable employees because of the necessity of curtailing promotions in recent years, it is very evident that this spirit of unrest and suspense will continue to be manifest unless some provisions are made for reasonable salary promotions. There will, no doubt, ensue a state of stagnation which will bring about the loss of most capable and trained men, while the lack of prospects of advancement would deter talented and ambitious men from seeking employment in the bureau to fill the vacancies of those who leave. Sooner or later, under these conditions, the force would be largely composed of employees of ordinary and inferior ability. Such a state of affairs would seriously impair the value of the scientific and technical work carried on by the bureau for the benefit of the public.

On account of the unpleasant nature of the work these inspectors are called upon to perform and the inadequate compensation allowed, the bureau has found it very difficult to obtain a sufficient number of veterinarians as evidenced by the following announcement:

The number of eligibles for these positions has not been sufficient to meet the needs of the service.

The above notice appeared in the Civil Service Manuals in announcing examinations for the position of veterinary inspector as follows:

January, 1901; July, 1901; January, 1902; July, 1902.

Also the following statement:

The supply of eligibles for this position has not been equal to the demand.

The above notice appeared in the Civil Service Manuals as follows:

July, 1903; January, 1904; July, 1904; January, 1905; July, 1905; January, 1906; July, 1906; January, 1907; July, 1907, January, 1908; July 1908; January, 1909; July, 1909.

The following notice shows the scarcity of eligibles:

As the commission has experienced considerable difficulty in securing eligibles for filling these positions, qualified persons are urged to enter this examination.

The above statement was contained in the following notices issued by the United States Civil Service Commission:

Notice No. 34, January 20, 1909; No. 415, July 5, 1911; No. 739; October, 4, 1911; No. 117, February 4, 1914.

There may have been still other notices printed but the Civil Service Commission has not been requested to report on the earlier examinations.

These various statements regarding scarcity of eligibles certainly does not indicate that applicants are standing in line waiting for the job. It is still necessary to hold frequent examinations for position of veterinary inspector as examinations have been held on the following dates since July 1, 1913:

July 2, 1913, September 10, 1913, December 3, 1913, February 4, 1914, March 11, 1914.

The Congressional Directory of the Sixty Third Congress, second session, page 328, shows that there is an increasing demand for veterinarians in the Federal service.

In many cases the employees who are leaving the service of the bureau to better their condition are some of the most experienced and trusted men. Among those who have left the service are the following:

John Schmidt, meat inspector, accepted position as superintendent, Cudahy Bros. Co., Cudahy, Wis.

Dr. O. E. Dyson, inspector in charge at Chicago, Ill., accepted a position with the packers at \$6,000 per annum.

Resignations during the last year:

Dr. Harry W. McMaster, Wichita, Kans., accepted position as manager of the Southwestern Serum Co., of Wichita, Kans.

Dr. J. Niel Huff, Dr. Frank Larson, Dr. W. Z. Ellis, and Dr. W. R. Laird, left the Sioux City, Iowa, force.

The veterinary inspector in charge at Lafayette, Ind.

W. N. Bryan, meat inspector, at Sioux City, Iowa, resigned to accept position as foreman of the dry salt department with the Cudahy Packing Co., at Sioux City, Iowa.

Dr. W. M. Gordon, supervisor at Sioux City, Iowa, salary \$1,900 per annum, resigned and entered business for himself.

Bruno Jacobs, inspector's assistant, Sioux City, resigned, salary \$840 per annum, accepted position with Serum Co.

Dr. Sneed, veterinary inspector, resigned at Omaha, Nebr., January 1, 1914, salary \$1,600, to engage in the manufacture of serum at a salary of \$2,400 per annum plus 10 per cent of the profits.

Dr. Huff and Dr. Troy also resigned to enter the serum business. A number of other veterinarians resigned to enter private practice.

During the year 1912 the following employees resigned at Portland, Oreg.

Meat Inspectors E. M. Jourdan, W. H. Hesser, and J. W. Hanners, salary in each case being \$1,000 per annum and each of them accepted positions with packing houses at \$1,200 per annum.

Other resignations at Portland, Oreg., in the year 1912:

Dr. I. N. Habecker, salary, \$1,400 per annum, accepted position as municipal inspector at North Yakima, Wash., at \$1,800 per annum.

C. L. Dengler, meat inspector, salary, \$1,000 per annum, accepted position as municipal meat inspector at North Yakima, Wash., at \$1,200 per annum.

Dr. J. G. Slee, salary, \$1,800 per annum, resigned to open up a hospital and to breed cats and dogs.

Resignations at Portland, Oreg., in the year 1911:

Meat Inspector S. W. Ammers, salary, \$1,000 per annum, accepted position as superintendent for James Henry Packing Co., at \$1,800 per annum.

Meat Inspector D. J. McKernan, and inspector's assistant, J. B. Anderson.

Resignations at Portland, Oreg., in the year 1910:

Meat Inspector O. L. Heyer; skilled laborers, J. B. Pendleton, and C. J. Kaufman and inspector's assistant, Caudy, more lucrative employment being secured in each case.

The following bureau employees resigned at Kansas City, Kans., during the past year:

Name.	Title.	Bureau of Animal Industry salary.	Business entered.
R. R. Grimes.....	Veterinary inspector.....	\$1,800	Serum business.
F. C. Cater.....	do.....	1,600	Do.
O. E. Troy.....	do.....	1,600	Do.
J. Eagle.....	do.....	1,800	Do.
J. D. Thrower.....	do.....	1,900	Do.
D. H. Burcham.....	do.....	1,000	Do.
G. E. Butin.....	do.....	1,600	Do.
E. L. Ritter.....	do.....	1,400	Do.
D. A. Bond.....	do.....	1,800	Back to the farm.
O. P. Tress.....	Inspector's assistant.....	1,000	Do.
Roy Leaf.....	do.....	840	Unknown.

During the past year four veterinary inspectors left the service at South St. Paul, Minn., two of whom were receiving a salary of \$1,800 per annum, and two were receiving \$1,600 per annum. One of these has taken up a different line of work, one entered private practice, and two are employed by firms manufacturing hog cholera serum and other biological products, their present salaries being higher than those they were receiving from the bureau.

The following employees resigned from Fort Worth, Tex., from January 1, 1913, to April 9, 1914:

Mark C. Sharpe, inspector's assistant, resigned July 1, 1913, to accept position in Postal Department at a higher salary.

Dr. George H. Gillette resigned after three days' service, in September, 1913, apparently owing to the fact that the salary paid by the bureau for the class of work required of him did not compare favorably with the salary and work of his former position.

Dr. Earl J. Meixel resigned after four days' service, in July, 1913, to return to a practice in Idaho, which he stated was more desirable and lucrative than the position of veterinary inspector with the bureau.

Dr. George E. Grogg, appointed, effective April 1, 1914, but resigned without reporting for duty.

William F. McCarty, meat inspector, resigned November 30, 1913, salary \$1,200 per annum, to accept position with the Sherman Cotton Oil Provision Co., Sherman, Tex., at a salary of \$150 per month.

Two inspectors' assistants recently resigned at Los Angeles, Cal., to accept position with the city of Los Angeles, at \$110 per month. An inspector's assistant recently transferred from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Los Angeles, Cal., reports that he can live more cheaply in Los Angeles than he could in Pittsburgh, indicating that the city was not paying such high wages simply because the cost of living was unusually high there.

At Fort Worth, Tex., during the last year, Dr. R. F. Eagle, resigned, salary \$2,000, to accept position with Schwarzschild & Sulzberger, salary \$3,120 per annum.

Dr. I. C. Mattatall, National Stock Yards, Ill., resigned, salary \$2,500, to accept position with Serum Manufacturing Co. at a higher salary.

The following employees resigned at the Chicago station of the Bureau of Animal Industry from March 1, 1913, to March 31, 1914:

VETERINARY INSPECTORS.

Dr. T. H. Jones; salary, \$1,600; resigned April 10, 1913.

Dr. F. H. Davis; salary, \$1,400; resigned April 19, 1913.

Dr. G. G. Grundy; salary, \$1,400; resigned July 23, 1913.

Dr. Charles Carson; salary, \$1,400; resigned September 8, 1913.

Dr. R. T. Fisher; salary \$1,400; resigned December 12, 1913.

Dr. E. A. Malloy; salary, \$1,400; resigned January 5, 1914.

Dr. F. E. Williams; salary, ———; resigned January 31, 1914.

Dr. F. C. Kartenbor; salary, \$1,400; resigned March 18, 1914.

W. T. Sparhawk; salary, \$1,800; resigned April 6, 1913, to engage in chicken raising and peach farming.

Dr. A. J. Stokes; salary, \$1,400; resigned September 25, 1913. (Worked only eight days and after learning the undesirable nature of packing-house work left the service.)

Dr. C. L. Ashbrook; salary, \$1,600; resigned October 15, 1913, to engage in hay and grain business.

Dr. T. A. McCarthy; salary, \$1,400; resigned November 12, 1913. (Had been assigned to tick eradication for two years, but left the service after working in the packing house for two weeks, went to Boston to enter hotel business.)

INSPECTOR'S ASSISTANTS.

I. J. Warden; salary, \$840; resigned April 16, 1913, to accept position with serum company, at \$1,200.

W. J. Peterman; salary, \$840; resigned August 30, 1913, to accept position with serum company, at \$1,200.

Homer Martin; salary, \$840; resigned May 21, 1913, to accept position as deputy State factory inspector at \$1,200 per year, with expenses.

G. E. Springer; salary, \$840; resigned September 6, 1913.

L. Hathaway; salary, \$840; resigned November 7, 1913.

T. O. Ticknor; salary, \$840; resigned November 30, 1913.
G. W. Freemarek; salary, \$840; resigned January 31, 1913.
C. M. Peterman; salary, \$840; resigned March 31, 1914.

The following inspector's assistants left the service of the Bureau of Animal Industry at Chicago, Ill., to accept positions as food inspectors with the department of health, Chicago, Ill., at an entrance salary of \$1,200 per annum, to be increased to \$1,320 after two years and to be increased to \$1,440 after four years and with all expenses paid when assigned to country work:

J. M. Coffey; salary with bureau, \$840; resigned March 4, 1913.
H. W. Ehret; salary with bureau, \$840; resigned March 5, 1913.
H. F. Pigott; salary with bureau, \$840; resigned May 14, 1913.
T. M. Robertson; salary with bureau, \$840; resigned July 26, 1913.
J. G. Fessenger; salary with bureau, \$960; resigned August 4, 1913.
R. E. Smith; salary with bureau, \$840; resigned September 30, 1913.
H. C. Johnson; salary with bureau, \$1,000; resigned January 26, 1914.

Meat Inspector R. Arnold; salary, \$1,200; resigned on January 31, 1914, to accept position with the department of health at Chicago, as stated above.

Meat Inspector P. R. Tenne; salary, \$1,000; resigned November 6, 1913, to engage in the retail meat business.

About 25 or 30 of the Bureau of Animal Industry inspectors took civil service examinations for the position of city food inspector at Chicago, Ill., on March 18, 1914, entrance salary, \$1,200 (maximum \$1,400 at end of four years), a six-hour day, no work on holidays of any kind or on election days, and free transportation on all car lines. The Bureau of Animal Industry inspectors are often called upon to work on holidays and election days, and they are not allowed free transportation on car lines. The Bureau of Animal Industry, therefore, can not expect to retain their efficient employees under these conditions unless an equitable salary schedule is provided for them. It would seem that efficient and satisfactory service should entitle civil service employees to permanent employment.

The following is an extract from a letter received from Dr. G. B. Young, commissioner of health, city of Chicago, dated April 9, 1914:

In answer to your letter of April 6, etc.:

The salaries paid to food inspectors in this department are as follows:

Supervising food inspector, 3, at \$1,620.

Food inspectors, 16, at \$1,440.

Food inspectors, 20, at \$1,380.

Food inspectors, 28, at \$1,320.

Food inspectors, 21, at \$1,200.

Advancements are made to the higher groups on the basis of seniority and efficiency and a year's service is required in each group before one is eligible to advancement.

The inadequate salaries of the employees of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry is the cause of a continual spirit of unrest and dissatisfaction in that bureau. Under date of March 21, 1914, Acting Secretary Galloway of the Department of Agriculture submitted the following statement:

Number of resignations among the classes of Bureau of Animal Industry employees referred to in the "Lobeck bill."

	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914, to Mar. 12.	Total by classes.
Veterinary inspectors.....	44	58	31	35	59	49	43	53	14	386
Meat inspectors.....	25	68	39	52	33	32	41	25	2	317
Taggers (later made inspector's assistants and skilled laborers).....	67	67	6	140
Inspector's assistants.....	19	33	30	30	41	46	10	209
Stock examiners.....	15	12	5	7	5	4	5	2	55
Skilled laborers.....	16	1	1	1	19
Clerks (in field).....	8	12	10	15	13	9	13	11	2	93
Total, by years.....	159	217	126	143	141	124	144	135	30	1,219

The following figures taken from Service Announcements of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, show the number of resignations of employees in that bureau during a period of one month:

Service announcement.	Date.	Pages.	Number resigned.	Month.
1.....	May 15, 1907	16-17	25	April, 1907.
2.....	June 15, 1907	4	22	May, 1907.
3.....	July 15, 1907	5	12	June, 1907.
4.....	Aug. 15, 1907	4	21	July, 1907.
5.....	Sept. 16, 1907	4	20	August, 1907.
6.....	Oct. 15, 1907	3-4	62	September, 1907.
7.....	Nov. 15, 1907	5	33	October, 1907.
8.....	Dec. 16, 1907	10	15	November, 1907.
9.....	Jan. 15, 1908	5	15	December, 1907.
10.....	Feb. 15, 1908	20	15	January, 1908.
11.....	Mar. 16, 1908	32	10	February, 1908.
12.....	Apr. 15, 1908	46	14	March, 1908.
13.....	May 15, 1908	57	15	April, 1908.
14.....	June 15, 1908	67	8	May, 1908.
15.....	July 15, 1908	77	13	June, 1908.
16.....	Aug. 15, 1908	87	12	July, 1908.
17.....	Sept. 15, 1908	97	15	August, 1908.
18.....	Oct. 15, 1908	106-107	47	September, 1908.
19.....	Nov. 16, 1908	118	18	October, 1908.
20.....	Dec. 16, 1908	133	12	November, 1908.
21.....	Jan. 15, 1909	9	13	December, 1908.
22.....	Feb. 15, 1909	18-19	14	January, 1909.
23.....	Mar. 15, 1909	25	9	February, 1909.
24.....	Apr. 15, 1909	36	15	March, 1909.
25.....	May 15, 1909	46	14	April, 1909.
26.....	June 15, 1909	52	5	May, 1909.
27.....	July 15, 1909	61-62	17	June, 1909.

MR. MAGUIRE. I am of the opinion that the salaries of the department ought to be reclassified, but I doubt the wisdom of taking one bureau of the department and not all of the other bureaus.

DR. WALKLEY. The idea is that we have got to start somewhere. The salaries of the letter carriers and railway-mail clerks were not adjusted in the same year, but at different times, and I presume after awhile Congress will get around to the other bureaus in the Department of Agriculture; at least we hope it will. It is the only way of getting the best men and having them satisfied.

In order to show that the salaries of the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry really need to be classified, more so than the salaries of employees in the other divisions of the Department of Agriculture, I will say that during the year 1884 the Bureau of Animal Industry started out with 15 employees and was limited by Congress to that number, at which time it was practicable to deal with the men

as individuals. On July 1, 1906, the number had increased to 1,455. On April 18, 1914, there were 3,552 employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry. The bureau officials will tell you that the force is now so large and the character of the work is such that it becomes necessary to consider the men collectively or in groups. To illustrate the difficulty in considering the employees separately now, will say that about April 1, 1914, there were in the city of Chicago 419 employees; in Kansas City, 211; in South Omaha, Nebr., 142; and in Kansas City, Kans, 211.

In the Bureau of Plant Industry the employees are engaged chiefly in research work or scientific investigations, while in the Bureau of Animal Industry the employees are engaged in a sanitary police work, enforcing rules and regulations. The Bureau of Plant Industry is composed chiefly of scientists and clerks, and on July 1, 1913, there were 797 collaborators, student assistants, etc., whereas in the Bureau of Animal Industry there were only seven employees of that class. These employees (collaborators, etc.) are all engaged in outside work in addition to the service that they render to the Government, and it therefore would not be practicable to regulate their salaries by law. They merely do special work for the Government when occasion in that particular section demands. The employees of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry are not allowed to engage in any other line of work and are subject to call day or night the same as a soldier.

In the Bureau of Plant Industry on July 1, 1913, there were 869 employees in the competitive class as compared to 3,058 employees in the competitive class in the Bureau of Animal Industry.

The United States meat-inspection service is the largest meat-inspection system in the world.

In the Bureau of Plant Industry the employees work on a project until it is completed, and then they take up another project. They might have 20 scientists at work and each one be at different projects, whereas in the Bureau of Animal Industry the 20 scientists would all be on one line of work. In the Bureau of Plant Industry there is a very small amount of routine work, whereas in the Bureau of Animal Industry a greater part of the work is routine in character. In the Bureau of Plant Industry the scientists investigating dry farming would be out on the desert, whereas the scientists investigating the grain questions would be in a different section, etc. In the Bureau of Plant Industry there are only a small number of men in the different projects, and the qualifications of different men assigned to one project is much different to the training required in the other projects.

But in the Bureau of Animal Industry the employees may be more properly considered as a group. In the case of the veterinarians their previous training has been standardized, as the Civil Service Commission states specifically that they must be graduates of certain colleges which have a specific curriculum. In the case of meat inspectors, stock examiners, and inspector's assistants the Civil Service Commission specifies how many years' experience they must have had in the employment fitting them for this particular line of work.

The problem of classification of salaries has passed beyond the experimental stage and it has proven a decided success in the Postal

Department. The employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry feel that the work in which they are engaged is equal in importance to that of the Postal Service. Unless a specific salary schedule is provided for the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry the force will soon be composed largely of mediocre talent; and when foreign countries become aware of this fact they will lose confidence in our inspection system, and there is liable to be another national sensation similar to that created by the Jungle, and our meat-inspection system may be held up to the world as a joke or at least as unsafe.

I feel that this list of injuries has a vital bearing on this case, as it shows the injuries that are peculiar to this occupation.

These statistics were supplied by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, recently, and are as follows:

Injuries sustained in the course of employment by employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry during years ended June 30, 1912, June 30, 1913, June 30, 1914 (to date of Mar. 12, 1914).

YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1912.

Department of Labor case No.	Name of employee.	Location.	Salary per annum.	Nature of injury.	Occupation.	Number of days disabled.
15460	Chas. Mack.....	Middlebury, Vt.....	\$540	Thrown down by horse he was treating; dislocation, right knee....	Laborer.....	51
15374	Geo. C. Peters.....	Buffalo.....	840	Fell down steps; fractured bones in hand.....	Inspector's assistant.....	21
16306	E. Dorr Allen.....	Jersey City, N. J.....	840	Hog head fell on knife, causing him to cut left wrist.....	do.....	8
14660	Ernest Schludenberg.....	Baltimore.....	900	Hog head fell on knife, causing him to cut right hand.....	do.....	15
14911	James F. Stewart.....	South Omaha, Nebr.....	1,000	Stepped on nail; punctured left big toe.....	Meat inspector.....	6
15375	Daniel J. McKernan.....	Fort Worth, Tex.....	1,000	Fell into hot-water sewer; scald, left ankle.....	do.....	5
16220	Edward Mahoney.....	Chicago.....	1,000	Slipped on wet floor; sprained ankle.....	do.....	17
17947	Claude D'Unger.....	New York.....	1,000	Steam hose was turned on him; scalded calves of both legs.....	do.....	24
14659	Edward M. Cowles.....	Cleveland.....	1,400	Cut hand on his knife.....	Veterinary inspector.....	5
16454	E. Blaine Haskin.....	Chicago.....	1,400	Struck hand against knife; cut right hand.....	do.....	3
16821	Edwin D. Schrock.....	East St. Louis.....	1,400	Slipped and cut left thumb with knife.....	do.....	3
16681	Calvin C. Cole.....	Chicago.....	1,400	Fell off platform; bruised right hip.....	do.....	6
17109	Franklin Pierce.....	do.....	1,400	Traveler fell from rail, striking his head; scalp wound.....	do.....	2
17108	Scott J. Rigdon.....	Osage City, Okla.....	1,600	Horse stepped on foot; amputation, right second toe.....	do.....	10
16867	Geo. Ryland Ward.....	South San Francisco.....	1,600	Cut by gutter; 2 fingers left hand.....	do.....	5½
17214	Geo. E. Dudin.....	Kansas City, Mo.....	1,600	Struck by cow; fracture, 3 bones in left hand.....	do.....	11
18703	James N. Currie.....	Storrs, Conn.....	1,640	Handling phosphorus; burns, both hands.....	Chemist.....	53

YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1913.

19866	Thaddeus R. Coleman.....	Chicago.....	\$840.00	Fractured 3 ribs; hog jumped on him.....	Inspector's assistant.....	41½
20351	Harold W. Householder.....	do.....	1,400.00	Cut right index finger with knife.....	Veterinary inspector.....	23
20365	Clinton F. Keiter.....	Jersey City, N. J.....	1,400.00	Fracture left arm; carcass fell on arm.....	do.....	59
20367	James H. Purnell.....	Beltsville, Md.....	840.00	Thrown from wagon; strained leg.....	Teamster.....	6
21576	Henry T. Hubbard.....	Chicago.....	840.00	Slipped and fell from car; dislocated coccyx.....	Inspector's assistant.....	7
21577	G. E. Coleman.....	Bethesda, Md.....	480.00	Bitten on hand by dog.....	Laborer.....	15
21589	James H. Williams.....	Richburg, S. C.....	840.00	Cattle dip splashed in eye; inflamed eye.....	Inspector.....	3
21597	S. C. Babson.....	South Omaha, Nebr.....	1,600.00	Cut right thumb with knife.....	Veterinary inspector.....	3
21598	Michael Chojnacki.....	Buffalo.....	900.00	Fell from ladder; fractured rib and injured head.....	Inspector's assistant.....	17
21694	Hubert L. Sharp.....	St. Joseph, Mo.....	840.00	Cut finger on bone making postmortem examination.....	do.....	5
21760	John E. McShane.....	Indianapolis.....	1,000.00	Cut self on trying knife; base of thumb.....	Meat inspector.....	9
21818	James F. Wedding.....	Beltsville, Md.....	21.50	Fell through hay chute to basement; bruised right hip.....	Unskilled laborer.....	35
21819	Wm. G. Strehlmann.....	Seattle, Wash.....	900.00	Fell from ladder; fracture left iliac crest; anterior spine.....	Inspector's assistant.....	60
21837	John D. Wright.....	South St. Joseph, Mo.....	1,800.00	Cut finger on knife while examining carcass.....	Veterinary inspector.....	10
21833	Robt. E. S. Thompson.....	Beltsville, Md.....	1,100.00	Cut thumb and two fingers on power saw.....	Carpenter.....	27
21854	Samuel A. Risley.....	South Omaha, Nebr.....	1,200.00	Cut palm of hand on his knife.....	Stock examiner.....	13

21947	Charles Vandervoort.	Detroit, Mich.	1,000.00	Slipped on icy steps and fell; sprained back.	Inspector's assistant.	5
21948	Frank C. McCurdy.	South St. Joseph, Mo.	1,800.00	Sliding door closed on hand; bruised left hand.	Veterinary inspector.	2
22501	Geo. C. Wellinger.	Wichita, Kans.	1,000.00	Vat of boiling water slushed over; scalded left foot and ankle.	Meat inspector.	26
22605	Emil C. Schaub.	Fort Dodge, Iowa.	1,000.00	Struck by ice falling from car; bruised forehead.	do.	4
22604	Clemmons G. Sutton.	South Omaha, Nebr.	1,000.00	Leg caught by steer against fence; bruised right leg.	Inspector's assistant.	21
22629	John J. Lintner.	Chicago.	1,400.00	Cut back of left hand with knife while examining carcass.	Veterinary inspector.	6
22697	Robt. E. Laake.	St. Louis, Mo.	840.00	Cut left index finger with knife while examining carcass.	Inspector's assistant.	1
22710	John S. King.	Beltsville, Md.	480.00	Kicked by horse; fractured nose.	Laborer.	9
22711	Wm. Williams.	St. Joseph, Mo.	1,400.00	Hook fell on head; scalp wound.	Meat inspector.	9
22712	Howard H. Devell.	Chicago.	1,400.00	Abrasion of finger; handling swine viscera.	Veterinary inspector.	2
22713	Edmund W. Ward.	do.	1,000.00	Fell on stairs; hernia and epididymitis.	Meat inspector.	70
22714	Homier Martin.	do.	840.00	Knife in carcass fell on hand; cut right index finger.	Inspector's assistant.	12
22715	Hugh T. Doak.	Los Angeles.	1,600.00	Cut right thumb on his knife.	Veterinary inspector.	19
22716	Jos. A. Shanley.	New York.	900.00	do.	Inspector's assistant.	6
22717	John F. Wellpott.	Campo, Cal.	2 2.00	Fell over rock; contusion of left elbow.	Laborer.	6
22718	Geo. E. Golden.	Chicago.	1,600.00	Cut thumb on meat hook.	Veterinary inspector.	6
22719	Chas. A. Braden.	Harrisonburg, Va.	660.00	Kicked by horse; fractured 2 ribs, pleurisy.	Unskilled laborer.	13
22722	Frank J. Ficker.	St. Louis.	840.00	Stuck knife into hand when truck ran into him.	Inspector's assistant.	23
22726	Chas. H. Harte.	Chicago.	1,600.00	Cut left thumb with knife while examining carcass.	Veterinary inspector.	8
22727	Frank L. Kampschmidt.	Los Angeles.	1,600.00	Slipped and struck hand on knife; cut 3 fingers of left hand.	do.	14
24962	Harvey B. Hood.	Darlington, S. C.	1,800.00	Climbing fence; rail broke, and he fell, bruising side.	do.	10
25013	Martin J. Heathman.	New Orleans.	840.00	Bruised hand on ice pick; abscess palm of hand.	Inspector's assistant.	20

YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1914.

26001	Jas. E. Parrent.	Louisville, Ky.	\$1,200.00	Cut his thumb with knife.	Meat inspector.	7
26005	Jas. T. Robertson.	South Omaha, Nebr.	900.00	Tripped and fell over switchboard while carding cars; bruised face, head, arm, and shoulder.	Inspector's assistant.	4
26010	Ralph E. Fraser.	Washington, D. C.	360.00	Scalp wound; cut by glass breaking from door during storm.	Messenger boy.	1
26011	Wm. R. Rosekrans.	New York, N. Y.	1,800.00	Strained ankle by slipping and wrenching same in stepping from platform.	Veterinary inspector.	1
26014	Wm. J. Haskins.	El Paso, Tex.	1,000.00	Elevator in which he was riding broke loose and fell to bottom of shaft, causing multiple bruises on body and arms.	Meat inspector.	22
26015	Clarence Ervin.	St. Joseph, Mo.	1,000.00	Burned on forehead and face by dipping fluid, which was thrown on him by the explosion of gas.	Inspector's assistant.	5
26017	Joseph F. Rosen.	St. Louis, Mo.	1,600.00	Cut self on right index finger when examining hog carcass.	Veterinary inspector.	11
26021	Joseph Hannon.	Chicago, Ill.	1,400.00	Bruised on instep by hog carcass falling from rail and roller fell on his feet.	do.	1
26022	Albert J. DeFossett.	do.	1,800.00	Cut his hand with knife.	do.	2
26029	Wm. R. Hynes.	New York, N. Y.	1,800.00	Cut his initial thumb with knife.	do.	2
26047	Louis Levenhagen, Jr.	Chicago, Ill.	840.00	Lacerated left hand while handling head of a steer and horn ran into hand.	Inspector's assistant.	13
26052	John A. White.	Front Royal, Va.	900.00	Fractured right leg at ankle by stepping on sloping bank and turning ankle.	Foreman.	6
26053	Jas. L. Brown.	Omaha, Nebr.	1,100.00	Cut left hand by galvanized iron that fell from ceiling.	Meat inspector.	12
26054	Jas. Roach.	South Omaha, Nebr.	1,200.00	Punctured palm of left hand by striking hand with tryer while driving it into bacon.	do.	6
26056	Raymond Grove.	Bethesda, Md.	480.00	Thrown against building while helping to hold unbroken horse.	Unskilled laborer.	1

² Per day.¹ Per month.

Injuries sustained in the course of employment by employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry during years ended June 30, 1912, June 30, 1913, June 30, 1914 (to date of Mar. 12, 1914)—Continued.

YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1914—Continued.

Department of Labor case No.	Name of employee.	Location.	Salary per annum.	Nature of injury.	Occupation.	Number of days disabled.
26059	Edward L. Wilson.....	New York, N. Y.....	\$1,400.00	Cut self with knife while making post-mortem.....	Veterinary inspector.....	2
26067	Ambrose B. Carpenter.....	Louisville, Ky.....	840.00	Cut self with knife.....	Inspector's assistant.....	9
26068	Frank J. Ficker.....	St. Louis, Mo.....	840.00	Foot caught between elevator and floor, causing laceration of big toe.....	do.....	5
26069	Edward Lee Moore.....	St. Joe, Mo.....	840.00	Cut self with knife.....	do.....	23
26070	Daniel R. Smith.....	Chicago, Ill.....	1,400.00	do.....	Veterinary inspector.....	24
26076	Roy E. Learn.....	do.....	840.00	Cut by knife in hand of butcher.....	Inspector's assistant.....	4
26075	Chas. J. Valver.....	Washington, D. C.....	600.00	Broke milk bottle and cut wrist on same.....	Laborer helper.....	3
26078	John A. Fitzpatrick.....	New York, N. Y.....	1,200.00	Fell and bruised right hip and left side.....	Meat inspector.....	(1)
26082	Chas. T. Keyser.....	South Omaha, Nebr.....	1,000.00	Slipped on icy place and fell, causing broken arm.....	Inspector's assistant.....	(1)
26085	Clinton Foster Kelter.....	Jersey City, N. J.....	1,400.00	Shoe caught in nail and threw him across floor, causing injury to left ankle and leg.....	Veterinary.....	(1)
26085	Emma J. Atkins.....	Washington, D. C.....	480.00	Right thumb cut while washing glass apparatus.....	Charwoman.....	(1)

1 Not reported.

The following statistics were furnished by Dr. A. D. Melvin, Chief of United States Bureau of Animal Industry:

[Bureau of Animal Industry, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., Mar. 13, 1914.]

Employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry injured in line of duty from October, 1908, to date.

Year.	Veterinary inspectors.	Meat inspectors.	Stock examiners.	Inspector's assistants.	Clerks.	Skilled laborers.	Unskilled laborers.	Total.
1914.....	1	-----	-----	1	-----	1	-----	3
1913.....	18	7	-----	11	-----	5	5	46
1912.....	12	4	2	8	1	1	2	30
1911.....	12	5	-----	5	-----	-----	1	23
1910.....	9	10	4	1	-----	-----	2	26
1909.....	11	5	3	7	-----	1	2	29
1908.....	4	2	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	6
Total.....	67	33	9	33	1	8	12	163

Mr. HELGESEN. Are they paid their salaries if they contract diseases of any kind?

Dr. WALKLEY. No, sir; we receive no compensation whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not have sick leave at all?

Dr. WALKLEY. We have 15 days' annual leave, but very often the men do not get that. I can cite you a number of cases where they do not get it because they did not have enough men to cover the job. The departmental regulations with respect to vacations provide that the men shall have them if the exigencies of the service permit; but very often the exigencies of the service are such that they prevent quite a number of the men getting vacations, and very often when they do get them they have to use the time in recovering from injuries received in the line of duty.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Are not the men compelled to take their vacations? Is it not required that they must take all of their leave within the year?

Dr. WALKLEY. No, sir; I can cite you any number of cases where they have not gotten it; I can give you the names and the circumstances.

Mr. HELGESEN. If you are laid off for 15 days because of injuries, would you not be entitled to an additional 15 days for vacation?

Dr. WALKLEY. Well, if I am injured before I take my annual vacation then I get 15 days' sick leave; but we will presume that the injury extends over a period of 30 days; then you are really deprived of a real vacation because you have used your full quota of time in recovering from an injury received in the line of duty.

Mr. MAGUIRE. You spoke of your annual vacation; you really get some vacation, do you not?

Dr. WALKLEY. Generally we do, but, as I have said, I can cite quite a number of men who have failed to get it because the bureau did not have enough men to cover their places while they were off. They can not let the men go unless the job can be covered by some one else.

ANNUAL LEAVE.

S. R. A.—B. A. I. 81, Service and Regulatory Announcements for January, 1914, page 15, reads as follows:

2. Unless prevented by the exigencies of the service all the employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry outside of Washington, D. C., except those serving under temporary appointments, those serving under probational appointment, and per diem

employees, may be granted annual leave at the rate of one and one-fourth days for each month of service rendered during any one calendar year: *Provided*, That temporary employees after a continuous service of one year may be granted such leave. Application for such leave is to be made on Form C. C. 2, a supply of which will be sent to all stations.

The exigencies of the service have prevented the following employees from receiving their annual vacation:

At Seattle, Wash., during the year 1913, four inspectors lost vacations, due to a short force and extra work. In the District of Columbia in the year 1913 the following employees lost their vacations: Dr. J. E. Lovejoy, 4 days; William D. Bucknam, meat inspector, 4 days; Dr. Davis, 5 days; S. A. King, meat inspector, 15 days; Dr. F. A. Hugins, 15 days.

At Pittsburgh, Pa., in the year 1913, very few bureau inspectors were able to get more than a few days annual leave at one time and several finished the year without getting their entire quota. This was due to the fact that there were not enough bureau inspectors at that station to cover the work and permit of annual leave for each employee. Many Government employees in Washington, D. C., get 30 days sick leave and 30 days annual leave, while Bureau of Animal Industry inspectors, outside of Washington, are only allowed 15 days annual leave and 15 days sick leave.

The inspectors just mentioned (Lovejoy, Bucknam, Davis, King, and Hugins) were not attached to the executive offices and therefore are usually allowed 15 days annual leave (vacation) plus 15 days sick leave (total 30), whereas the Bureau of Animal Industry employees in the executive offices are allowed 30 days annual leave plus 30 days sick leave or total 60 days in one calendar year.

Outside of the District of Columbia the Customs Service employees, also many employees in the Internal Revenue Service, are allowed 30 days sick leave plus 30 days annual leave (total 60 days) each calendar year, against total of 30 days allowed employees of this bureau outside of Washington.

Those employees of the bureau who lose their annual vacations during one calendar year due to shortage of men or to any cause can not take them during any succeeding year.

SICK LEAVE.

The departmental ruling regarding sick leave appears in Bureau of Animal Industry Service and Regulatory Announcements, S. R. A.—B. A. I. No. 81, of January, 1914, page 15, and reads as follows:

10. Employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry outside of Washington, D. C., except employees serving under temporary appointment, employees serving under probational appointment, and per diem employees paid "for days actually employed," in exceptional and meritorious cases may be granted sick leave at the rate of one and one-fourth days for each month of service: *Provided*, That temporary employees after a continuous service of one year may be granted such leave. Sick leave may be granted upon any one of the following conditions:

(a) Where some member of the immediate family of an employee is afflicted with a contagious disease on account of which health authorities usually maintain a quarantine, and requires the care and attendance of such employee.

(b) Where through exposure to contagious disease, whether in his own family or not, the employee's presence on duty would jeopardize the health of his fellow employees or his official associates.

(c) In exceptional and meritorious cases, where the employee is personally ill and where to deprive the employee of sick leave would work peculiar hardship.

Mr. HAUGEN. How much leave are you entitled to?

Dr. WALKLEY. Sick leave 15 days and 15 days annual leave.

Mr. SLOAN. With pay?

Dr. WALKLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HELGESEN. You are paid for the 15 days of vacation but not for the sick leave?

Dr. WALKLEY. We are allowed a total of 30 days during any one calendar year with pay. If I use up my 30 days in annual and sick leave and then receive an injury during the same calendar year which lays me off for 6 months I do not get one penny in salary while absent from duty nor do I receive any compensation for the injury. The employee pays his own medical bills.

Mr. HAUGEN. The same rule applies in all departments?

Dr. WALKLEY. No; in the Postal Service I believe they now have a compensation system whereby an employee is granted leave with full pay during period of disability not exceeding one year and thereafter at the rate of 50 per cent of the employee's salary for a period exceeding one year but not exceeding 12 months additional, and in case of death his family or their legal representative will receive \$2,000, but in this bureau there is no law like that at all. If a man dies as a result of being injured in the line of duty his family is left dependent.

The provision to which I refer is contained in the post-office appropriation bill for fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and applies to railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks, supervisory officers, post-office inspectors, letter carriers, rural carriers, post-office clerks, and special delivery messengers.

Now, referring to the question asked by Congressman Moss about butchers being exposed to "perils and disabilities," will say that even though the work of butchers and other packing-house employees is attended with hazards it should be borne in mind that in the larger plants when the butcher is injured he is sent to the company's physician at no expense to himself, which is a privilege the bureau inspector can not enjoy. Furthermore, the packing house employees have their rights under common law—whereas in the case of a Federal employee he can not bring an action, as there is no such thing as an employer's liability in the Federal service. The private employees in about 20 American States are now protected by the workmen's compensation acts. The absence of similar laws applying to employees of this bureau is one reason we are advancing in asking for an equitable salary schedule, in order that we may be enabled to pay these medical bills.

I will also state that the act of May 30, 1908, granted compensation in case of injury to Federal employees in the Bureau of Mines, Lighthouse Service, Forestry Service, Isthmian Canal, manufacturing establishments (including navy yards, Reclamation Service, fortification works, Government Printing Office, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and all repair shops).

The principle is admitted that workmen should be compensated for injuries arising out of their employment. But unfortunately the employees of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry are not protected in this respect.

In the Bureau of Animal Industry the employees are running a great risk if they purchase homes. In many cases the employees are caused to lose as much as \$200 through the sale of their homes, which are disposed of on account of the inspector being transferred to another station.

The Bureau of Animal Industry has made the following announcement regarding the assignment of employees: Service Announcement No. 8, December 16, 1907, page 3:

ASSIGNMENT OF EMPLOYEES.

Bureau employees who have previously been in the service of establishments having inspection should not be detailed to bureau work in the same establishments at which they were formerly employed if this can reasonably be avoided.

Service Announcement No. 52, August 15, 1911, page 60:

ASSIGNMENTS OF EMPLOYEES TO STATIONS.

The assignment of bureau employees to duty at certain stations must depend entirely on the exigencies of the service. Employees should understand that no assignment can be considered absolutely permanent. When an employee is transferred at his own request the bureau, of course, will endeavor to retain him in the new assignment just as long as conditions warrant such action, but whenever the needs of the service demand his further transfer this will be done, and it is expected that he will readily comply with instructions without protest.

Service Announcement No. 50, April 13, 1912, page 35:

EMPLOYEES AVAILABLE FOR TRANSFER.

It is found that the expenses incurred by the bureau for salaries paid from the various appropriations are running close to the limit of the funds allotted for the use of the bureau, and it will be necessary immediately to make a considerable curtailment in these items of expense. New appointments or promotions will therefore be out of the question except in extreme emergencies; and vacancies must be filled, just as far as possible by transfer within the bureau. With this end in view each inspector in charge is directed to forward to the Washington office immediately the names and designations of all employees who can be spared for transfer in case of urgent need, indicating the preference of each as to assignment. The employees proposed for transfer must, of course, make no definite plans for transfer until so instructed specifically, but they must understand that when the needs of the service demand their transfer they must comply with the instructions if they desire to continue in the service. Each employee named, however, may be assured that he will not be transferred against his wishes if this can be avoided without impairment to the service.

Service Announcement No. 31, November 15, 1909, page 87:

RETRENCHMENT IN MEAT-INSPECTION EXPENDITURES NECESSARY.

On account of the large increase in the number of establishments under Government inspection since the enactment of the present meat-inspection law, the bureau finds that unless current expenditures are considerably curtailed the available appropriation will not be sufficient for this year's work. Each inspector in charge of meat inspection will therefore carefully consider the matter of assignments at his station, and, if possible, arrange for a reduction in his present force, and inform the Washington office of the names of employees available for transfer.

The bureau transfers inspectors miscellaneously and inspectors are often assigned to duty in stations a great distance from their homes, which proves a great expense to the inspector, due to the cost of travelling to and from his home in case of illness in the family.

The opinion exists in some quarters that when inspectors in the Bureau of Animal Industry are transferred from one station to

another it is due to their services having been unsatisfactory. As a matter of fact, the more efficient and capable an employee becomes in this bureau the more liable he is to be transferred, as the bureau generally sends men of experience to new stations.

In many cases the transfer of employees causes them great inconvenience and expenditure of money. The Bureau of Animal Industry will only pay the freight charges and cartage charges on 3,500 pounds of household goods. See Service Announcement No. 51, July 15, 1911, page 52, from which the following is an extract:

TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS AND PERSONAL PROPERTY OF BUREAU EMPLOYEES.

[File No. 49.]

3. In no case will an employee be permitted to ship at the expense of the department more than 3,500 pounds of his property. This allowance will cover his household goods and his personal property used in official work.

4. It is intended that the provisions of this regulation shall apply only to those employees who are transferred from one force to another. Employees whose official stations are changed from time to time on the same force, as in the quarantine service, will not be permitted to transfer their household goods at the expense of the department in connection with such changes of official stations.

This matter is also referred to in Service Announcements Nos. 44, 45, and 55.

In connection with the transfer of household goods the following notice was contained in S. R. A.—B. A. I. 81 for January, 1914, issued February 10, 1914, page 13:

SHIPMENT OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS AND LIVE STOCK OWNED BY EMPLOYEE TRANSFERRED FROM ONE STATION TO ANOTHER.

Memorandum No. 65 of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, dated January 28, 1914, amends paragraph 9 (L) of the Fiscal Regulations to read as follows:

An officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture transferred from one official station to another for permanent duty, in addition to actual traveling expenses provided for in the Fiscal Regulations of the department, may hereafter, within the discretion and under written instructions of the Chief of the Bureau, Service, or independent division, or office in which the officer or employee serves, be allowed freight and drayage charges for the transfer of his household effects, and of other personal property used by such officer or employee when transferred, in official work, not exceeding in all 3,500 pounds in addition to the weight of live stock: Provided, that saddle and other animals will be transported at Government expense only when used in official work and that the number will in no case exceed three heads.

The Forester may authorize the district foresters to issue written instructions under which transferred employees may be allowed freight and drayage charges for the transportation of their household effects and other personal property with the same effect as if the instructions had been issued in person by the Forester, etc.

Inspectors in the quarantine work often find it necessary to travel on Sunday in order to reach the point of inspection in time to begin work early Monday morning.

One of the inspectors in the quarantine division recently arrived at his home in Washington at 1 a. m. on Sunday and left again at 10 a. m. on same day and his official duties would not permit him to return home until 1 a. m. the following Sunday.

In the case of the outbreak of foot and mouth disease the inspectors were rushed out to this work on only a few hours notice and some were away from home as long as five months. This notice being so short, it gave them no time in which to arrange their business affairs prior to departure.

The former Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. James Wilson, in his statement to the House Committee on Agriculture on December 17, 1912, pointed out the necessity for transfer in the Department of Agriculture as follows:

They are not usually assigned to permanent duties at a permanent office or station, but their field of action is changed from time to time to meet emergencies or to study new phases of the problems which they are engaged upon.

The Bureau of Animal Industry formerly made public announcement showing the frequency of transfers within the service.

The following figures taken from service announcement of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, show the number of transfers of employees in that bureau during a period of one month:

Service announcement.	Date.	Pages.	Number transferred.	Month.
2.....	June 15, 1907	4-5	42	May, 1907
3.....	July 15, 1907	5-6	47	June, 1907
4.....	June 15, 1907	17-18	84	Apr., 1907
5.....	Aug. 15, 1907	3	62	July, 1907
6.....	Sept. 16, 1907	3	39	Aug., 1907
7.....	Oct. 15, 1907	2-3	48	Sept. 1907
8.....	Nov. 15, 1907	3-4	56	Oct., 1907
9.....	Dec. 16, 1907	8-10	91	Nov., 1907
10.....	Jan. 15, 1908	4-5	54	Dec., 1907
11.....	Feb. 15, 1908	19-20	43	Jan., 1908
12.....	Mar. 16, 1908	31-32	41	Feb., 1908
13.....	Apr. 15, 1908	45-46	77	Mar., 1908
	May 15, 1908	55-56	47	Apr., 1908

In many cases the bureau employees are transferred within the service on such short notice that it is out of the question for them to crate and prepare their goods for shipment, and they must, therefore, call in men who make this a business. This item of expense often exceeds the freight charges. I know of one inspector transferred from Milwaukee, Wis., in March, 1913, to tick eradication work in Mississippi. He paid \$20 to have his goods crated, and, as it was very uncertain as to how long his service would be needed in Mississippi, he placed his furniture in storage in Milwaukee, and has already paid \$28 storage charges on same. The weight on which the department will refund the cost of cartage and freight charges on household goods being limited to 3,500 pounds often means an item of expense to the inspectors who are transferred, as in many cases their household goods exceed 3,500 pounds in weight.

One of the inspectors in quarantine work, eradicating sheep scab, was transferred twice at his own expense in the West, and states that the expenses in both cases not chargeable to the department was about \$50. On account of the uncertainty of transfer and on account of the employees having to pay the expense of transferring their furniture, in some cases, there are several married men in the quarantine work who do not keep a house, but take furnished rooms, not by preference, but through necessity.

In many cases there is much sorrow resulting from these transfers within the service. One of the veterinary inspectors recently transferred, who is one of the most capable men in the service of the bureau, was transferred because a man of his experience and ability was needed in the East. The employees are seldom consulted regard-

ing these matters, but simply receive instructions which necessitates their leaving their homes which they may own, and in which they may be well situated and content. One veterinary inspector recently wrote that on account of recent transfer it would cost him \$250 to sacrifice his furniture, etc., and that having to rent his home meant a further sacrifice in wear and tear, to say nothing of the tears of his wife, who was leaving her old and invalid father in the care of strangers simply because it was impossible to carry him with them.

The bureau recently estimated that the annual losses due to scabies of sheep and cattle in the United States amounted to about \$4,600,000. These losses are now much less than formerly, because the bureau has eradicated these diseases from the greater portion of the territory in which they existed. Twelve or fifteen years ago nearly all the territory west of the Mississippi River was more or less infected. As a result of the bureau's work the quarantined area has been gradually reduced, until it is now comparatively small and the losses are correspondingly less.

The area under quarantine for sheep scabies on March 14, 1914, comprised all of Texas, most of California, and small portions of Utah and Colorado. The territory remaining under quarantine for scabies of cattle comprised portions of Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, and Texas.

It is to be regretted that this great work can not be properly followed to a conclusion. The following letter shows how the work is being retarded and the conditions under which employees of this bureau are sometimes transferred:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
Denver, Colo., December 18, 1913.

Dr. W. L. HANSON,
Gordon, Nebr.

SIR: I am in receipt of a letter from the department stating that it will be necessary for us to reduce the number of men on this force, effective about January 1, due to the lack of funds for the inspection and quarantine work.

I have therefore submitted your name to the department as one of those that might be transferred if they so desire. I also explained to them that the men I have designated as available for transfer are not men that I am anxious to get rid of, but are designated on account of their locality more than any other reason.

I am very sorry it becomes necessary to reduce the force at this time, as we have work enough for all; but it seems compulsory. I can not say at this time whether you will be transferred or not, but I am sending to you this advance information, thinking it might be of some benefit to you a short time in advance to know that there is a possibility of your being transferred.

Very respectfully,

W. E. HOWE, *Inspector in Charge.*

Dr. Hanson has since been transferred to Milwaukee, Wis.

Wealthy stock men of the West, who have learned the value of the inspection, when learning that our inspectors are being transferred from field work and assigned to duty in packing houses are greatly displeased and in some instances offered to get up a monster petition to be forwarded to the bureau officials to have the inspector remain there.

The stockmen say that they have cooperated with the Government in an effort to eradicate cattle mange and sheep scab from their herds and from the ranges, and now, when an inroad on these diseases is being made, they feel it is not giving them a fair deal to take the inspectors away, as the chances are that the parasites will spread

and become as prevalent as they were prior to the inspection of the ranges.

In order to show that the stockmen of the West suffer in many ways from the shortage of bureau inspectors I might say that practicing veterinarians charge \$10 per head for inspecting cattle to be shipped interstate. Hence if an immigrant has only two head of cattle it costs him \$20 to obtain the certificates from a practicing veterinarian, necessary to make the transfer. The bureau makes a great number of these tests free of charge when they have a sufficient number of inspectors in the field, but the force of inspectors in the field at present is so short that the bureau has had to discontinue making these tests to a great extent.

Sheep scab was wiped out of Converse and Natrona Counties in the State of Wyoming, which means that 1,000,000 sheep were made free of the disease in one summer. This is a good example of the valuable work that the bureau inspectors are doing in the field inspection.

FIELD.

The employees in the Field Inspection Division are rendering an invaluable service to the live-stock industry of the South.

It is gratifying to the bureau inspectors and to the stock owners to note the progress made in cattle tick eradication, as shown in Bureau of Animal Industry Service Announcement No. 80, December 15, 1913, pages 111-112.

[Southern cattle at the International Live-stock Exposition. By George M. Rommel, Chief of the Animal Husbandry Division, Bureau of Animal Industry.]

"Every great exposition, whether of live stock, manufactures, or fine arts, has some one outstanding feature—a signpost, as it were, which indicates significantly an advance in progress or unfolds a prophecy of future development. The International Live Stock Exposition, which was held at Chicago, Ill., November 29 to December 6, 1913, was, in point of average excellence of the animals exhibited, the greatest which has been held since its inception in 1900.

"Its great significant feature was the exhibition, for the first time in competition with cattle from all over the United States and Canada, of two herds of cattle from below the old Texas-fever quarantine line. The Lespedeza farm of Hickory Valley, Tenn., was said three years ago to be the worst tick-infested farm in the State of Tennessee. The farm is now free of ticks, has been released from quarantine, and showed its shorthorn herd at the 1913 international, winning a number of prizes. The farm of W. J. Davis, Jackson, Miss., was released from quarantine only a year ago. Mr. Davis had his herd of Herefords at the international and won the grand championship for Hereford bulls with Point Comfort 14th. This bull was bred and raised in Arkansas, below the quarantine line. He won strictly on his merits as a southern bull, bred, raised, and fitted on southern feeds and pastures. Mr. Davis sold a yearling bull by Point Comfort 14th at the Hereford Association's sale on Friday afternoon, December 5, for \$575, and a bull calf by the same sire at the same sale for \$440. These facts show the possibilities of the South as a breeding ground for fine cattle.

"Inspectors engaged in the work of tick eradication can use this feature of the 1912 International to good advantage in furthering the work of tick eradication in their territory. The exhibition of these two herds at Chicago is believed to open an epoch of great development in the rebuilding of the cattle industry in the South which will have a profound effect on beef-cattle raising both from the standpoint of the breeder and the feeder."

The annual losses in the Southern States from Texas fever in cattle prior to the inauguration of the tick work averaged 8 per cent of the herds or \$34,000,000. This represents loss from death alone, not including other depreciations, such as stunted growth, discrimina-

tion in markets, shrinkage in milk production, all of which would more than double the amount named.

A report issued by the Bureau of Animal Industry April 4, 1914, shows that the progress made in tick eradication has increased the value of southern cattle, made the tick-free cattle one-fifth heavier, and the grade or quality has increased one-fourth, illustrating the fact that the tick and the unprofitable "scrub" are closely associated.

Tick eradication is also responsible for the increase of 23 per cent in the yield of milk.

There are at present about 200 inspectors assigned to tick eradication.

The quarantine line is being gradually pushed farther south and already 215,908 square miles have been released from quarantine. This means they have cleaned up an area greater than four States the size of New York. It is to be regretted that this work is being retarded. The southern farmer appreciates the value of tick eradication and the Bureau of Animal Industry has urgent requests from a number of farmers who desire the work taken up on their farms. As the bureau has not a sufficient number of men, the desired work can not be done this year and in consequence thereof the farmer will continue to suffer, either from death of cattle or loss in weight, decreased milk production, etc.

MEAT INSPECTORS.

The first examination for this position was held on July 21, 1906 (The title then being Inspector of Meat Products) and the requirements at that time for applicants was that they should be between 21 and 50 years of age and must have had experience for one year or more in slaughtering, curing, packing, or canning meats.

The entrance salary was \$1,000 per annum.

The second examination was held on October 17, 1906, and the title was then changed to "Meat Inspector." At this examination the age limit was changed from 50 to 55 years and the weight of practical questions was changed from 25 to 50 and the weight for experience was changed from 60 to 35, showing that knowledge was to be given preference over length and quality of service. This seems just and proper. At this time it was stated that clerical work, routine duties, experience in butchering, or cutting would not qualify the applicant to the privilege of taking the examination.

At the third examination, March 6, 1908, the weight of practical questions was again changed from 50 to 55 and experience from 35 to 30, again giving preference to knowledge, but here specifying that no applicant would be considered unless he had had at least five years' experience in the practical end of the business.

The fourth examination was held November 16, 1910. The conditions for this examination were similar to the one on March 6, 1908, except that the commission stated that preference may be given to men that had resigned from the service and wished to be reinstated and to fill vacancies by transfers if necessary.

The last examination was held March 3, 1913, and was similar to the last two preceding examinations. The only noticeable changes in the educational tests from the first was on letter writing, the weight on which was changed from 1 point to 5. The requirements for appli-

cants contained in Announcement No. 152, issued by the U. S. Civil Service Commission for the examination of "Meat Inspector" on March 3, 1913, reads as follows:

"Applications will be accepted only from persons who have had not less than five years' experience in curing, packing, or canning meats, and who by reason of their experience in canning rooms, dry salt or sweet pickle cellars, sausage, lard, oleo, butterine, or beef extract departments are competent to inspect meat and meat food products as to their soundness, healthfulness, and fitness for food. Persons whose experience has been confined to weighing, scaling, or clerical work, or who have been engaged solely in the occupation of meat cutter, butcher, or handling fresh meat, will not be considered for this position."

It will thus be seen that these inspectors are men who are skilled in their particular line of work. Bureau of Animal Industry Order No. 150, regulation 2, section 1, paragraph 6, page 6, reads as follows:

Meat inspectors.—These employees are laymen, experienced in the curing, canning, packing, or otherwise preparing of meat; they supervise that work and the use of permitted preservatives described in regulation 22.

Meat inspectors are classed as technical employees in the bureau. These employees also enforce the regulations regarding sanitary conditions, equipment, and methods, and therefore must be high-class men with practical experience. It is very important that these employees have a highly developed sense of smell. They can not properly perform their duties when suffering from an intense cold in many cases as they can not determine then whether the meat is wholesome or unsound. A meat inspector in Milwaukee in the year 1913 underwent an operation on his nose which cost \$50. The operation was to remove a portion of the bone of the nose. This became necessary on account of the severe nasal catarrh with which he was suffering, which was no doubt due to the sudden changes of temperature and working upon damp floors.

Meat inspectors when suffering from catarrh or a cold in the nose can not afford to follow the custom of going to the corner drug store and purchasing nostrums with which to treat the derangement, as this often deadens the sense of smell. They therefore find it necessary to consult a catarrh specialist.

Among the meat inspectors appointed in 1906 at an entrance salary of \$1,000 per annum, some were promoted to \$1,200 in November, 1908; others received that promotion in June, 1911; while others received it in June, 1913.

INSPECTOR'S ASSISTANTS.

The first examination held by the Civil Service Commission for this position was on September 5, 1907, and stated that the applicant must have had at least three years' experience in handling meats or meat-producing animals and be 5 feet 7 inches in height without shoes.

These employees are included in the group of technical workers in the Bureau of Animal Industry. Bureau of Animal Industry Order No. 150, regulation 2, section 1, paragraph 8, reads as follows:

Inspectors' assistants.—These employees are laymen, who are first assigned to routine duties and are promoted through examinations to higher duties such as conducting ante-mortem and post-mortem examinations.

There are inspector's assistants who entered the service in 1904 and who had every reason to believe that their services had been satisfactory who are now receiving a salary of only \$1,000 per annum.

There is an inspector's assistant in Buffalo, N. Y., who has been in the bureau service 20 years and his present salary is \$1,000. About two years ago he was injured while in the performance of official duties (skull fractured) and incurred a medical bill in excess of \$50 (U. S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor statistics, case No. 21598).

STOCK EXAMINERS.

The United States Civil Service Commission Schedule of Examination, revised to July 1, 1897, page 34, section 82, shows that applicants for this position must have had at least three years' experience in handling meat or meat-producing animals and such experience to be shown in answer to question 12 on the application blank. Entrance salary, \$900 per annum. The Civil Service Manual, revised to January 1, 1898, page 57, section 106, shows that stock examiners are required to have the knowledge of the appearance and conditions which accompany the more common diseases of the food-producing animals and that they must have had at least three years' experience in handling meat or meat-producing animals. In many cases the stock examiners are men who have formerly served the bureau as taggers or inspector's assistants, who through such service have become experts in the bureau routine and thoroughly acquainted with the rules and regulations. These men assist in ante-mortem and post-mortem work, and in many cases they work long and tedious days on post-mortem inspection of sheep and calves. In the ante-mortem work they are exposed to the danger of being attacked by animals in crowded pens, etc.

SKILLED LABORERS.

These employees are required to take a third-grade examination by the United States Civil Service Commission. In the Bureau of Animal Industry they are engaged either directly or indirectly in technical work of a very important nature. The Bureau of Animal Industry Order No. 150, regulation 2, section 1, paragraph 10, refers to them as follows:

Skilled laborers.—These employees supervise the marking of meat and meat containers and perform similar work. They are eligible for promotion only through examination.

Some of the skilled laborers in the Bureau of Animal Industry are receiving \$60 per month, some \$70 per month, and others \$75 per month. There is one in Milwaukee, Wis., who has been in the service since October 16, 1907, and his rate of compensation is still \$60 per month. This man has a family to support. He has recently written to Dr. A. D. Melvin, chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, a letter explaining the difficulties he experiences in conducting his finances in such a way that he may "keep above water." In a recent letter this skilled laborer wrote as follows:

As for savings and pleasures, I am out of the race.

Does it seem consistent that a man with a family, wearing a Government badge, and working in water and blood and steam should receive only \$720 per annum? The cost of living is advancing so rapidly that it is very urgent that something be done to relieve the situation. The skilled laborer whom I mention is subject to the same injuries from changes of temperature, moving trucks, etc., that have already been mentioned. Suppose he should suffer an injury while in the performance of his official duty, which necessitates a doctor's bill of \$25 or \$50. His salary of \$60 per month would not go very far in meeting such emergency.

CLERKS.

The United States Civil Service Commission requires that the clerks pass a first-grade examination and the clerks for this bureau are certified from the regular departmental register of eligibles. Owing to the fact that the work of this bureau is of a scientific and technical nature it naturally follows that the longer a clerk is in the service of this bureau the more technical his services become and the more valuable he is to the bureau, as his familiarity with the medical terms necessarily employed in the correspondence and his knowledge of the bureau rules and regulations increase with each year's service. There are very efficient clerks in the service who have been recommended by their inspectors in charge for an increase in salary on several occasions, but the said increase has not been made. There are efficient clerks in the bureau who have been receiving a salary of \$1,000 per annum since December, 1910.

In this connection I respectfully quote a news item appearing in the Salt Lake City Tribune, Salt Lake City, Utah, April 10, 1914, page 13.

TO RAISE SALARIES IN AUDITOR'S OFFICE.

Increases in salary for three employees in the auditing department were agreed to by the city commission, in committee of the whole, yesterday afternoon. The increase will amount to \$27.50 a month for the three, \$10 each for two and \$7.50 for one.

The chief accountant will be paid \$135 instead of \$125 a month; the warrant clerk \$120 in place of \$112.50, and the voucher clerk \$110 instead of \$100.

The work of the three employees of the Salt Lake Auditing Department above mentioned is about on a par with the Bureau of Animal Industry station clerks at Salt Lake City, but the salaries of the Bureau of Animal Industry clerks only range from \$900 to \$1,200 per annum. The salaries of all city and State employees in Utah are considerably in advance of the Federal employees. The chief of the city department of health receives \$3,600 per annum, his assistant \$2,400, and the chief of the dairy and food division \$2,400, each of whom is a practicing physician with a large practice in addition to their official duties and salary. The chief sanitary inspector receives \$1,500 per year. His qualifications being about on a par with those of many employees of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry who receive much smaller salaries. One of the clerks in Salt Lake City entered the Bureau of Animal Industry Service in 1905 at a salary of \$720 per annum and he reports that his expenses at that time for the four necessities of life, food, fuel, clothing and shelter, were 30 per cent of his salary. This clerk has been in the service nine years and is now receiving a salary of \$1,000 per annum

and his expenses now for the same four items, food, fuel, clothing and shelter, are 64 per cent of his salary. He has not been able to save anything from his salary for the past four years, which is due to the difference between 70 per cent of \$720 and 36 per cent of \$1,000, the residue of his salary after cost of necessities is deducted.

The impression may exist in some quarters that a clerk in this bureau has a "snap" and his duties require no study, but as a matter of fact they must make a very careful study of all the meat-inspection and quarantine laws and be rapid penmen and mathematicians. It often becomes necessary for them to visit the slaughter house to make investigations regarding reports on meat-inspection labels or the disinfection of stock cars, and in compiling data regarding violations of the 28-hour law and violations of meat-inspection law. In such cases they then become exposed to the dangers from slippery floors, moving trucks, etc., and as they are not provided with two suits of clothing as are the inspectors who work in the slaughter-houses every day they often have their best clothing soiled with blood from the cattle or hogs.

I contend that the services performed by the clerks of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry is just as important to the people of this country as the work being carried on in the Reclamation Service. One fact that I feel merits serious consideration is that a clerk in the Reclamation Service draws a higher salary for the first day that he works in that department than many of the clerks in the Bureau of Animal Industry draw at the end of six years' service.

The following letter is self-explanatory:

UNITED STATES RECLAMATION SERVICE,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1914.

Hon. C. O. LOBECK,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR Mr. LOBECK: Your letter of April 6, 1914, has been received requesting information concerning entrance salaries, number of employees, percentage of resignations, salary schedule, and intervals of promotions in the Reclamation Service.

The usual entrance salary for bookkeepers and general clerks is \$1,200 per annum and for stenographers and typewriters \$1,020 per annum.

The table below shows the number of employees in the service at the close of June and December, of each of the past four years:

	Classi- fied em- ployees.	Laborers.		Classi- fied em- ployees.	Laborers.
June, 1910.....	1,560	3,863	December, 1910.....	1,222	2,882
June, 1911.....	1,699	6,576	December, 1911.....	1,457	6,184
June, 1912.....	1,729	4,739	December, 1912.....	1,489	3,610
June, 1913.....	1,685	4,926	December, 1913.....	1,551	3,988

The percentage of separations, including resignations, furloughs at the close of seasons, deaths, etc., are approximately 38, 40, 43, and 41, respectively. The percentages are based upon the average number of classified employees during each year. Similar data concerning laborers are not available, and could not be given with any degree of accuracy on account of the large number of separations after but short periods of service.

A regular schedule of salary grades has been established following the recommendation of the committee on departmental methods. Promotions have been made on a merit basis. The Secretary of the Interior has ruled that promotions should be made once a year on July 1, except in particularly meritorious cases.

Sincerely,

WILL R. KING, *Chief Counsel.*

In the quarantine work and import inspection we discontinue inspections at sundown, while in the packing houses we must remain on duty as long as they continue operations.

In many cases the men assigned to 28-hour-law investigations work from 10 to 16 hours per day.

During the year February 1, 1913, to February 1, 1914, in Milwaukee, Wis., one of the meat inspectors at a sausage factory averaged $10\frac{1}{2}$ hours per day, deducting 45 minutes for lunch, leaving an actual working day of $9\frac{3}{4}$ hours.

In order to show that the inspectors at the smaller stations also work long hours I will say that at Grand Rapids, Wis., the inspectors are on duty about 60 hours per week, including 3 hours every Sunday morning, when an inspector is present to supervise packers draw off the lard, making an average of 9 hours per day for each inspector at Grand Rapids, Wis., for 6 days per week.

At Fort Atkinson, Wis., the inspector is on duty 10 hours per day, and when he is called upon to make tuberculin tests it keeps him busy all day Sundays.

During the busy season he remains until 8.30 p. m. to seal the tanks.

At Menominee, Mich., average $10\frac{1}{2}$ hours per day.

At La Crosse, Wis., all the inspectors work 10 hours per day.

I merely mention these stations as an example as some seem to be under the impression that the inspectors at smaller stations do not work long hours.

Clerks in Washington are required to work not less than seven hours. But as a general thing the clerks outside of Washington work eight hours and in many cases longer.

The following shows the large amount of inspection done by six meat inspectors at Cudahy, Wis., from November 1 to November 29, 1913, inclusive:

D. S. meats.....	4, 044, 587
S. P. meats.....	2, 166, 672
Lard and oleo.....	1, 405, 610
Sausage.....	507, 730
Smoked meats.....	351, 169
S. P. meats shipped.....	350, 000
Export shipped.....	3, 868, 501
Total.....	12, 694, 269

SUNDAY WORK.

New York City and Brooklyn, N. Y., Jersey City and Newark, N. J., are the only cities in the United States where slaughtering is conducted under Government supervision on Sunday as a regular practice; in the cities named slaughtering is conducted each Sunday in the year.

One of the bureau inspectors is on duty three hours every Sunday morning at Grand Rapids, Wis., to supervise the packers in drawing off the lard.

At some of the smaller stations the veterinarians, in addition to working 10 hours each week day at packing houses, are sometimes called upon to do tuberculin testing, in which case he is kept busy all day Sunday. At some stations the inspector's assistants are required to work every third Sunday on patrol duty.

Referring to the discussion yesterday regarding the rate of compensation for employees at small and large establishments, will say that, in my opinion, it would not be consistent to pay smaller salaries to those employees at stations where they only work a few hours per day. There is only a small number of such places and the employee is not often left there permanently, and even so it may be that he is already being sufficiently inconvenienced by being stationed at a point that is quite distant from his home, which necessitates the expenditure of a considerable sum of money in visiting his home in case of illness there. The Civil Service requirements are the same for all, and the chances are that, when that inspector is transferred from the small station, he will be assigned to duty at a plant where the hours are so long he will more than make up for the short days at the smaller station.

It is also a fact that the inspector at the smaller station must assume greater responsibilities than some of the inspectors at larger stations. At some of the larger stations there are many employees who have one or more superiors at that station who are held responsible by the chief of the bureau, but at the smaller station the employee is often designated as inspector in charge, which means that he is held individually responsible and must report direct to the chief of the bureau.

In the eighties there was much agitation in Great Britain on account of the frequent occurrence of cruelties in the trans-Atlantic shipping of animals. Many ships unsuited to the purpose were used. Many animals were lost at sea while those arriving at destination were in deplorable condition. In the act of March 3, 1891, Congress gave the Secretary of Agriculture authority to enforce regulations against these abuses.

Employees in the Quarantine Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry in inspecting ships carrying export animals, enforce regulations as to fittings, equipment, ventilation, feed, water, attendants, etc., and the losses in transit have been reduced to one-third of 1 per cent and insurance rates fell from 8 to less than 1 per cent. The bureau inspectors have been instrumental in reducing the frequency with which animals in transit have been subjected to cruel treatment. This has been accomplished through the enforcement of the 28-hour law, the purpose of which is to prevent cruelty to animals during interstate shipments. This law requires that animals be unloaded for food, water, and rest at stated intervals. From the enactment of the present law to the close of the fiscal year 1912, a total of 4,274 apparent violations were reported by the Department of Agriculture to the United States Attorney General for prosecution. Of this number, verdicts were obtained for the Government in 3,035 cases.

In accordance with the sentiment of our Chicago convention, this association has during the past year invited all members of Congress to visit packing houses, stock yards, and dipping vats in order to observe the magnitude of our work. We felt that our cause was just and that our work would bear the most searching investigation. I think you will find that the majority, if not all, of your colleagues who appeared before your committee have witnessed the bureau work. The only regrettable feature is that a couple of our friends in Congress came near ruining their clothing by having blood splashed

on them while on these tours of inspection, but that is simply one of the undesirable features of our work.

On behalf of our association I now extend to the members of this committee a most cordial invitation to visit the packing houses and stockyards during the recess of Congress, as we feel that you will then appreciate fully the conditions under which the inspectors work.

Drs. Moore and Ravenel were appointed by the Hon. David F. Houston, Secretary of Agriculture, and by the Hon. Jas. Wilson, former Secretary of Agriculture, to make an official investigation of the meat-inspection system of the U. S. Bureau of Animal Industry, and it is gratifying to know that when they made those tours of investigation they found the inspectors on the job and attending to business.

I thank you, gentlemen, for giving us this hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. You have entirely finished, Doctor?

Dr. WALKLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOBECK. Before I ask Mr. Pagle to make some remarks Congressman Baltz wishes to speak. Mr. Baltz represents a large packing center in East St. Louis and wishes to state that he is in favor of the bill.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM N. BALTZ, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS.

Mr. BALTZ. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I will not discuss the merits of this bill, because I think the gentlemen who have appeared before this committee understand the work of these people engaged in the Bureau of Animal Industry better than I do. However, in my district there is a national stockyard, and I think in that district there are about 140 men employed. I believe that these men deserve an increase in wages for the reason that the cost of living has increased considerably within the last 10 or 15 years, and the wages of these men have not increased.

Mr. HELGESEN. Are we not told that the cost of living has decreased because of recent legislation, so that that would not be an argument?

Mr. BALTZ. It has decreased to some extent, but I am not here to discuss the tariff at this time. I simply want to say that I am in favor of this bill and trust it can be favorably reported.

STATEMENT OF MR. CHARLES W. PAGLE, JR., STOCK EXAMINER, UNITED STATES BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY; SECRETARY, BUFFALO BRANCH No. 22, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY EMPLOYEES, BUFFALO, N. Y.

Mr. PAGLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in behalf of Buffalo branch of the National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees I wish to indorse this bill, and will say that Buffalo has the largest stockyards east of Chicago. It is also one of the largest slaughtering centers in the United States. At Buffalo there is a diversity of work, such as meat inspection, stockyards inspection, import inspection of cattle, sheep, swine, and horses, inspection of all sheep, cattle, and horses exported from this station,

testing cattle with tuberculin, testing horses with mallein, investigation of alleged violations of the 28-hour law and of the meat-inspection law, supervising the cleaning, washing, and disinfection of cars which have arrived with diseased animals, also the cleaning and disinfecting of pens which have been used by diseased animals, etc.

In carrying out this work it requires veterinarians, inspector's assistants, stock examiners, skilled laborers, clerks, and meat inspectors. These employees are required to work long hours, also to perform work at night and on Sundays and holidays. The duties require that the employees be familiar with many regulations. The employees of the Buffalo branch hope that the Lobeck Bill will be given your favorable consideration.

SUNDAY WORK.

At Buffalo, N. Y., in many cases the veterinary inspector, stock examiners, and skilled laborers begin work at 8 a. m. Sundays.

At 10 a. m. temperatures are taken of any cattle that are to be shipped interstate and also of cattle being imported for breeders and feeders from Canada. Temperatures are taken again at 2 p. m., 6 p. m., and 10 p. m., and the tuberculin is injected at 10 p. m. It will thus be seen that during the first day of the test the inspector is on duty in the yards 13½ or 14 hours.

On the second day they begin at 6 a. m. and take temperatures of the cattle every 2 hours until 4 p. m., and it takes until 5 p. m. to complete the chart and other clerical work at the barns, which means a 10½ or 11 hour day.

The above work does not occur on every Sunday, but one veterinary inspector is required to report for duty each Sunday to inspect horses being shipped interstate to States specifically requiring a Federal test. This calls for about 3 to 5 hours' work each Sunday.

Mr. LOBECK. Congressman Mitchell wants to say a word in regard to the bill. He has been here for quite a while, and only wants to take a minute or two.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. MITCHELL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not want to interrupt the argument of the gentleman, but I want to have the record show that I am in favor of this bill. I attended the meeting of the New England Association during the winter, and I know that the men are capable and efficient men, and that they are doing splendid work in the community. I think it would be a step in the right direction if these salaries were standardized and if these men were put in a position where they would receive some assurance that their services were well compensated and some assurance of permanency in this service.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Mitchell.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES T. McDERMOTT, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am in favor of this Lobeck bill because it carries out the purposes of the enactment of the law when put into operation, namely, that the employees would receive an increase in salary. The salaries pro-

posed in this bill are not one dollar too high, and last year I voted for the \$200,000 increase in the annual appropriation, and this year I voted for an added \$100,000 increase, making a total increase of \$300,000 for this year, so as to take care of the worthy employees of this Bureau of Animal Industry. I think section 8 of this bill covers the principal points, namely, that the department shall have authority to appropriate the necessary money to cover these provisions for a yearly increase, thereby giving these men a regular standing, so that they will know they will receive a yearly increase.

I represent the district that has the largest packing industries in the world; and of the 400 or more employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, I personally know a large number of them, and they are men of high intellect and honesty, working all kinds of hours; and I shall vote for this bill, knowing that I am only doing my duty to a set of worthy and deserving employees whom I have the honor to represent.

**STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE E. GORMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS.**

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am very much in favor of the classification of the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry as such classification is provided for in what is known as the Lobbeck bill. Such a classification will make for efficiency in the service, and will be beneficial, not only to the men employed in the service, but to the Government as well. This is particularly true as applied to men in the service below the grade of veterinary inspector. The veterinary inspector, with his professional knowledge, while he is, of course, a very important factor in the inspection of food products, yet he is equipped with information and knowledge that enables him, if the Government service becomes arduous or unpleasant, to get work in private employment along the line of his profession, which will pay him as much, and perhaps more, than the Government service pays him. The meat inspector, however, and the skilled laborers employed in the meat-inspection service, are differently situated. Not being professional men, their opportunities are necessarily limited and in time they become unfitted for other work than that in which they are engaged. Those who remain a long time in the service become expert in their line of work and the Government gets the benefit of their expert knowledge, but while they are becoming experts in this one line of work, they are unfitting themselves for any other pursuit.

They work under conditions which at times become dangerous to their health. I have seen these men at their work in the stockyards at Chicago, and they have, from time to time, occasion to go from departments of the establishment where the temperature is as high as 80 or 90 degrees, and, without time or opportunity to make a change of clothing, into departments where the temperature approaches and sometimes is below the freezing point. This occurs, in some instances, several times in a single day. The men in this service are also subject to transfer from place to place throughout the country, the general purpose of such transfers being in the line of promotion, but this theory of promotion is sometimes based, not upon an increase in salary or an easier character of work, but upon the theory that the

new position involves greater responsibilities, and on the occasion of such transfers; while the Government pays the transportation of the inspector and makes some contribution to the expense of moving his furniture, it does not pay the expense of transportation of his wife and children. This is a very considerable disadvantage to a married man.

I mention these matters, not as reasons why there should be classification in the service, but to direct the attention of the committee to some of the difficulties to which the men in this line of service are subjected. The principal reason, as I view it, why there should be classification in the service in which these men are engaged is that it holds out to the men the certainty of increase in salary conditioned only upon their faithful discharge of duty and the maintaining of a certain efficiency. If there is any doubt as to whether or not the Lobeck bill, as at present drafted, requires of the men that they will receive promotion only upon the ground that they are maintaining their average standard of efficiency and faithfully discharging their duty, I am sure the men themselves would want that feature made clear. I am personally acquainted with a large number of the men employed in the Bureau of Animal Industry, and from my knowledge of them I feel perfectly safe in saying that they would not expect to get an annual increase in salary if they were not deserving of it. Under the present existing conditions increases in salary are made from time to time, but these increases are not so made as to do entire justice to all who merit the increase. It has happened in the past, and no doubt it will happen in the future, under the present conditions, that some men will be favored in the matter of promotion and others will be slighted, either intentionally or otherwise, and the fact that such conditions exist has a tendency to demoralize and impair the efficiency of the service.

If the matter of promotion or increase in salary is fixed by law, conditioned only upon the faithful performance of duty and the maintenance of an average standard of efficiency, the men employed in the service will then know that favoritism can not obtain; that prejudice, if any has existed, can not intrude itself further upon the service; that every man will have a fair and equal opportunity, and that his annual increase, until the maximum of salary is obtained, depends, not upon the whim or disposition of some person higher in authority, but upon himself alone.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, and others that might be suggested—but I shall not take the time of the committee to state them (they have, however, very largely been suggested by other gentlemen who have spoken here)—I urge the favorable recommendation by the committee of the Lobeck bill.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALFRED G. ALLEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to say a few words in favor of the principle contained in the Lobeck bill (H. R. 9292) without reiterating what has been said or going too much into detail.

A classification of the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry is not only proper, but essential to the proper working of this great bureau. These men are doing fine work and performing efficient service and are entitled to every consideration which the importance of their work demands.

It was found advisable in the Post Office Department to classify the employees, arranging them in grades and automatically promoting them as they developed efficiency to the highest grades. This has resulted in increasing the efficiency of the men to the great improvement of the service. Only the most efficient men reach the highest grades.

I believe that such a plan can be worked out by your committee in the Bureau of Animal Industry. Great credit is due the inspectors for the services they are performing, and it is appreciated by the public. These men are subjected to rigid discipline, and some are subject to change from time to time from one part of the country to another. I know a number of the inspectors in my own city. They are diligent in their efforts and do their work without being offensive to the packers, thus insuring cooperation. I have heard a number of packers speak encouragingly of the work. This, as I said before, not only insures cooperation, but assures a great mass of the people of an almost perfect food supply.

In addition, these Federal inspectors have proved of great assistance to the local authorities, and they even confer on local matters of interest in their respective departments. The men who are back of this bill have shown their spirit of fairness by asking for a measure which will enable them to prove their efficiency and to receive promotion only when they deserve it.

I believe you have the material now before you which will enable you to prepare a classification bill which, while it may not meet the individual views of each one of us, yet on the whole will be a decided improvement over present conditions, and will provide a standard salary system and promote the efficiency of the men and enhance the work of the bureau. I trust that this will be taken up and worked out by your committee at an early day.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE C. SCOTT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA.

Mr. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE COMMITTEE: Representing as I do a district in which are situated extensive live stock interests as well as large packing industries, I very much favor the principle outlined in this bill. I am not here to say that the bill ought to pass in its exact form, although I am frank to say that it seems to me the bill as it is now drawn appears to be a good one and probably as equitable as any other that may be devised. I want to submit to the Committee in this connection a number of communications from my district, favoring the bill. First, I desire to submit a request unanimously made by the board of directors of the Sioux City Commercial Club favoring the bill; second, the favorable request of the Sioux City Live Stock Exchange; and, third, an extensively signed petition by the employees of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry employed at Sioux City.

It has been suggested by some at this hearing that the passage of this bill would result in a demand by the employees in other departments of the government for treatment of like or similar character, and it has been asked why this class of employees should be singled out for special legislation. My answer is, for the good of the service as well as for the good of the class of men employed. It should be constantly borne in mind that the work this class of employees is required to do is a work prescribed definitely by law. We have made legal requirement for meat inspection and general sanitation and government supervision of these industries. The work of the Bureau in this respect is constantly increasing and developing. It is a work that must go on, and whenever the appropriation made by Congress for this work is found insufficient or likely to be exhausted, unlike the work in many departments of the government neither the amount of work nor the standard of service can be reduced. There is but one way to meet the increase upon the demands of the Bureau and that is to increase the work of the men and withhold the proper and reasonable increase of their compensation. I think the committee all realize that in a measure the men of this department of the service have all felt the burden of these conditions. As nearly as I can learn, this has militated in some degree against the efficiency of the service, and has been a hardship upon the employees. One very material consideration in connection with the work of this Bureau is the irregular hours of duty. These men must be on hand to do the work at the time it is required. Shipments of stock do not arrive at regular intervals at the great markets where slaughtering is done, and ante mortem examination must be promptly attended to. This frequently calls men on duty before daylight in the morning, on Sundays, and at other times when employees in other departments of the government are released from duty. And in this connection the committee must not overlook the fact that when these irregular and excessive calls are made upon the men in this department they receive no extra pay for overtime. A man may be required to work half the day on Sunday, but he receives no compensation for it; he must do this extra work in order to hold his job.

It has all been made clear to the committee, and I am sure the committee understands the standard of learning and general professional equipment required to do this class of work and to do it well. The compensation and prospects connected with this bureau must be such, if the service is to be held up to the proper standard, that will induce the right kind of men to equip themselves for this work and to stay in the service. This is what the Government desires. A man for this service can not be picked up at any time and at any place. A few days' or weeks' preparation does not safely equip an ordinary man for any part of this work. I hope that the committee will be able to see its way clear to report this bill in at least as good a form as it now is.

As evidence of the interest that is being taken in this bill I present letters and resolutions from the following. I will leave these for the consideration of the committee:

1. The Sioux City Commercial Club, Sioux City, Iowa.
2. The Sioux City Live Stock Exchange.
3. Sioux City Branch No. 13, National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees.

**STATEMENT OF HON. WM. J. CARY, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN.**

Mr. CARY. Gentlemen of the committee, I wish to say a few words in behalf of the Lobbeck bill which is now being considered by you, also to call your attention to a few facts which may be of information to all.

It is a crying shame that these worthy men have been so long neglected by the United States Government. I have been personally interested in their work and know that it is attended with many hazards. I know one inspector, a friend of mine (Dr. Cochrane), who was injured by having a large iron roller or hook fall upon his head. These injuries are very dangerous, as the atmosphere being damp the iron is always rusty, which increases the liability to tetanus.

Dr. Wachs was injured by having a side of beef fall and drive a large butcher knife through his hand.

Dr. Digman was injured by a cow kicking the skin off of his legs between the ankle and knees. Many of the inspectors are carrying accident insurance, upon which they pay the premiums themselves. This is all wrong. The butchers that work around them are protected by State workmen's compensation laws. In the absence of similar legislation in favor of the bureau inspectors they should be taken care in the shape of a specific salary schedule and automatic promotion, similar to that enjoyed by the postal employees.

Congress has regulated the salaries of the letter carriers and postal clerks, who work in the pure fresh air or in comfortable offices. I ask you, in all fairness, Is it consistent to deny classification to these employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry who are working in blood, water, and steam?

I sincerely trust that the members of the committee will see their way clear to do something for these men.

The following news item appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel, April 13, 1914:

TO STANDARDIZE SALARIES—BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY WORKERS INTERESTED
IN BILL.

The Milwaukee branch of the National Association Bureau of Animal Industry Employees in Milwaukee is deeply interested in the passage of the Lobbeck bill now before Congress, which bill embodies the salary schedule adopted at the meeting of the national association held recently in Chicago. It is claimed that under present conditions many employees in the inspection of meats have become dissatisfied with conditions and have resigned to take up other work. This was due largely to the irregularity of promotions. This in turn is said to be due to lack of proper appropriations.

The following item appeared in The Gazette, Green Bay, Wis., January 8, 1914:

MORE ABOUT MEAT INSPECTION.

Beef cattle killed in Wisconsin packing plants under Government inspection are to a great extent shipped from the West. As is well known range animals are comparatively free from tuberculosis. The larger proportion of our Wisconsin cattle slaughtered for food purposes pass through packing houses not inspected.

Swine constitute the greatest Federal inspection problem. During the autumn evidences of hog cholera are found in a considerable proportion of the carcasses. Throughout the entire year, tuberculosis is the predominant disease among hogs.

According to figures secured from reliable sources, of 1,013,000 Wisconsin swine slaughtered in 1911, a trifle over 12 per cent were retained by inspectors. Of this number 98 per cent were tuberculous.

Of 935,871 slaughtered in 1912, over 15 per cent were retained, of which about the same percentage were tuberculous. In the first ten months of the present year, of 745,456 animals over 17 per cent were retained.

An increase from 12 per cent to 17 per cent in animals inspected is most important. It is significant either of an increase in the amount of tuberculosis amongst Wisconsin hogs, or of closer inspection in the packing houses. The former explanation would offer good reason for study upon the part of the agriculturists. The latter would be cause for gratification upon the part of the consumer of meat passed by Federal inspectors.

The principle which underlies the United States "Pure Food Act" will gradually be extended to all food products. Obviously, the cost of inspection and guarantee will fall upon the ultimate consumer.

Health is dependent upon purity of food. Among the very poor it is even more dependent upon quantity. If quality increases cost to those in meager circumstances, cost will reduce quantity. To some the high cost of living means only a curtailment of luxuries. To others it is identical with "the high cost of health."

The following item appeared in the Republican of Stanley, Wis., January 9, 1914:

MEAT INSPECTION.

The United States Government provides for inspection of all meat-packing plants which are engaged in interstate and foreign commerce. The methods employed in large plants are exceedingly interesting. First, an inspection is made of all live animals, and "suspects" are culled for especially careful observation and regulated handling. After slaughter each process in the further preparation of the carcass for the market is carefully watched. The inspectors become highly skilled in the detection of evidences of diseased tissue which passes under their eyes and hands.

As in the case of the first live inspection upon the first suspicion of disease an indelible brand suspends further preparation of the meat. The carcass is then shipped to a special examining room for further study and final disposition. By this means, to reach the consumer the body of a diseased animal would have to pass the marvelously keen observation of a number of highly skilled inspectors.

The diseases most often found are tuberculosis and actinomycosis in cattle; tuberculosis, hog cholera, and various blood and organic diseases in swine.

Some States have provided for inspection of abattoirs not under federal jurisdiction. Wisconsin has made no such provision. Dealers are sometimes suspected of offering for sale to inspected packing houses only these animals which are presumably healthy. If this be so, meat from uninspected slaughterhouses is apt to be considered below the normal average as concerns freedom from disease.

In addition to the detection of diseased meat, the inspectors maintain a close surveillance over the general cleanliness of the plant. If the packers ever resented the rigid demands of the Government, no such resentment is now manifest. Undoubtedly they recognize the Government stamp of approval to be of distinct commercial value.

The committee thereupon adjourned.



